The Catholic Historical Review

Volume XXVIII JULY, 1942 No. 2

THE JACOBEAN OATH OF ALLEGIANCE AND ENGLISH LAY CATHOLICS

An infinitesimal percentage of the lay Catholics of England were implicated in the ghastly Gunpowder Plot of 1605. This is a matter of record as is also the fact that the half dozen leaders of the conspiracy were known to be violently antagonistic to the administration and had been under close government surveillance since the closing years of Elizabeth's reign. It is likewise a matter of record that the demands of justice were fully satisfied in the condign punishment meted out to the plotters. With these facts before him the historian can view only as a tragedy the fierce assault made upon the innocent thousands of loyal subjects whose only offence was membership in the same religious organization to which the conspirators were attached.

After centuries of misrepresentation and vilification at the hands of professional and amateur writers alike, Catholics of early seventeenth century England are now beginning to receive treatment more in accordance with their deserts. In place of the customary excoriations of the "detestable papists" whose name was long associated if not actually identified with subversive intrigue, such dispassionate judgments as that made by Godfrey Davies are becoming increasingly common. Having analyzed the parliamentary act of 1604 which confirmed and extended the severe penal laws of Elizabeth, Davies continues: "Even this comprehensive code failed to satisfy the bigotry of parliament, and the Gunpowder Plot of which the vast majority of Roman Catholics were entirely innocent, was made the occasion for an increase in penal legislation."[1] And the Protestant historian, Walter H. Frere, concludes his comments on the anti-Catholic legislation of 1606 with the poignant observation: "Their cup was indeed now full; beyond three small additions to these penal laws in 1612 and 1628, protestant ingenuity had no more that it could devise against its unfortunate victims."[2] These and other evidences of a marked trend toward an objective presentation of this phase of history are gratifying to everyone who is desirous of obtaining an accurate picture of the past. It is regrettable, however, that the emendations introduced by scholars have not as yet filtered down to the textbook level. Numerous citations could be offered in substantiation of this assertion. Among the most popular English history texts in American colleges are those written by W. E. Lunt and A. L. Cross. Both dismiss the oath legislation and its enforcement with such summary flourishes that an utterly false impression is bound to be created in the student's mind. The former declares: "James sanctioned the legislation but openly allowed it to remain unexecuted."[3] And Cross hurriedly observes: "These penalties were not enforced, partly because the pacific King did not want to drive the Catholics to desperation, partly because he was frequently in negotiation with Spain."[4]

These statements do not square with recorded facts. The only historical foundation supporting them are the gratuitous protestations made by King James. Time and again the Stuart monarch declared publicly that scarcely any effort was being made to enforce the oath legislation. In 1609, for instance, he wrote in his *Premonition*: "So far hath both my heart and my government bene from any bitterness, as almost never one of those sharp additions to the former Lawes hath ever bene put in execution."[5] And in his *Defense of the Right of Kings* he stressed the point with even greater emphasis:

---

[1] *The Early Stuarts, 1603-1660* (Oxford, 1937), p. 205.

[2] *The English Church under Elizabeth and James I* (London, 1904), p. 330.

[3] *History of England* (revised edition, New York, 1938), p. 390.

[4] *A Shorter History of England and Greater Britain* (revised edition, New York, 1939), p. 289.

[5] *The Political Works of James I*, ed. Charles H. McIlwain (Cambridge, 1918), p. 113. Hereinafter cited as *Works*.

> Hitherto during the time of my whole raigne to this day, (I speak it in the word of a King, and trewth it selfe shall make good the Kings word) no man hath suffered corporall punishment in other kinds, merely or simply, or in any degree of respect, for his conscience in matter of religion.[6]

Before examining the evidence preserved in public and private documents, it would be well to recall a few of the essential preliminary facts in the case. The oath formula approved by parliament and sanctioned by the king was posited within a framework of over seventy articles[7] which were aimed to impose the most severe strictures on Catholics of every class. According to James it was "ordained for making difference betweene the ciuilly obedient Papists and the peruerse disciples of the Powder-Treason."[8] It was to be administered to all who were known to be or suspected of being recusants, i. e., English subjects who absented themselves from Anglican services.[9] Should a recusant refuse to take the oath when tendered to him by a bishop or two justices of the peace, he was to be consigned to the common gaol and held there without bail until the next court session. Recalcitrants at this time incurred the penalty of *praemunire,* which included deprivation of all civil rights, loss of all property, and perpetual imprisonment.[10]

---

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 257. This was written nearly ten years after the passage of the oath legislation. That those who were punished for refusing to submit to these laws could not, in James's opinion, be considered as suffering "for conscience in matter of religion" was made clear in his speech to the judges in Star Chamber in 1616: "I confess that I loathe to hang a priest only for religions sake and saying mass; but if he refuse the oath of allegiance which (let the Pope and all the devils in Hell say what they will) yet (as you will find in my book and by divers other) is merely civil, those that so refuse the oath and are polupragmatic recusants I leave them to the law; it is no persecution but good justice." *Constitutional Documents of James I*, ed. John R. Tanner (Cambridge, 1930), p. 22.

[7] 3 Jac. I, cc. 4 & 5, *Statutes of the Realm*, IV, 1071-82.

[8] *Works*, p. 85.

[9] *Statutes*, IV, 1073.

[10] *Ibid.*

Viewed from any one of the multiple objectives which it may have been designed to achieve,[11] the oath of allegiance was unquestionably a masterpiece of political wizardry. With such cunning ingenuity was the formula phrased that not one of its statements could be categorically condemned as opposed to defined Catholic dogma. On the other hand, not a few of the complex and ambiguous sentences patently admitted of an interpretation antithetical to the Church's doctrine. Little wonder that it swept the Catholics of England into a maelstrom of torturing bewilderment. Considering the peculiar complexity of circumstances in which they lived, it would have been surprising if they had taken a united stand regarding the liceity of accepting the oath.

True, no Catholic would jeopardize his faith by acknowledging James as " true and rightful King "; nor should he have the slightest scruple in swearing " to disclose and make known unto his Majesty all treasons and traitorous conspiracies which I shall know or hear of to be against him." Altogether different was his reaction likely to be, however, when called upon to

> truely and sincerely acknowledge, profess, testify and declare in my conscience before God and the world . . . that the Pope, neither of himself, nor by any other authority of the Church or the See of Rome, or by any means with any other, hath any power or authority to depose the King . . .

This question of the pope's deposing power was charged with controversial dynamite. In fact, its inclusion in the oath formula launched a book war which spread over most of Europe and blazed at white heat for many years. This interesting phase of the subject has been adequately treated by such scholars as La Servière, Brodrick, and McIlwain. At present we are concerned with the oath itself and the reactions of those who were required to take it. It would be reprehensibly unhistorical as well as grossly unfair to impose our twentieth century mentality upon the Catholic Englishman living in the early seventeenth century and then attempt to determine what decision he should have made regarding the deposing power. To do so would expose one to the unflattering accusation of reading history backwards.

---

[11] In addition to the purpose alleged by the king many others were in evidence. Parliament incorporated the oath in a statute entitled, "An Act for the better discovering and repressing of Popish Recusants." From contemporary accounts contained in the Lansdowne MSS, 153, ff. 84, 190, and the *Hardwicke State Papers*, I, 445-6, it is evident that one aim was the application of a veneer of legality to the plundering of private Catholic wealth. Chief Minister Robert Cecil who took an active though, as usual, not too conspicuous part in pushing the oath legislation through parliament bluntly told the Venetian ambassador: " There is no doubt that the object of these laws is to extinguish the Catholic religion in this kingdom." Molin to Doge, *Cal. S. P. Ven.*, X, 230.

It will be remembered that the popes in the Middle Ages had been granted by common consent a certain authority over civil rulers and that this authority included, under special conditions, the right of deposition. With relatively few exceptions theologians of the early seventeenth century recognized the legitimacy of these rights, though they did disagree on such points as their origin and limits and the advisability of exercising them. The Appellants' " Protestation of Allegiance " of 1603 had been condemned by the theological faculty of Louvain precisely because it expressed a denial of the pope's indirect power in temporal affairs.[12] In fact, the papal prerogative of deposition was impugned only by the Gallicans and this small school maintained its view only as a probable opinion. Hence it was unlawful for any Catholic to deny a doctrine so widely taught.[13]

Could it be expected, then, that an English Catholic would go immeasurably further and swear

> I do from my heart abhor, detest and abjure, as impious and heretical, this damnable doctrine and position, that princes which be excommunicated or deprived by the pope may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or any other whatsoever?

This is a typical example of the perplexing ambiguities contained in the formula. A Catholic was bound by his faith to deny that princes could be murdered. Refusal to abjure such a statement would brand the recalcitrant as a desperate character. Yet this clause is inextricably tied up with other decidedly objectionable declarations. To pronounce the above sentence without qualification would be tantamount to affirming that the Church had for centuries tolerated heretical doctrine. During the course of the controversy, James and his corps of apologists maintained vigorously that the oath was wholly concerned with civil matters and had no reference whatsoever to things spiritual. Yet we cannot refrain from asking, as McIlwain does in referring to this section of the formula: " What is this but to declare all holders of such a doctrine to be heretics? Could it be said that this requirement had nothing to do with things spiritual? " [14]

---

[12] Charles Butler, *Historical Memoirs* (London, 1819), I, 269.

[13] Brodrick's apt remark is worth recording: "It is beside the point to say that the theologians were wrong in forgetting that the medieval theocracy had passed away never to return. They might have been, but what really matters is that they taught what they did teach." *Life of Cardinal Bellarmine* (London, 1928), II, 176.

Furthermore, since the oath was sanctioned by the King and administered in his name, the conclusion seems inescapable that the juror was to be obliged to acknowledge a Protestant monarch's right to determine matters of orthodoxy. Of course, James might scoff at such a rationale, as he actually did some years later. But what assurance did his Catholic subjects have that this would not be proclaimed as the official interpretation once they had submitted? With good reason, then, does von Ranke contend that by the oath of allegiance ". . . the supremacy of the King would be practically acknowledged and the connection of the English Catholics with the Papacy dissolved." [15]

The two bills embodying the new penal code were passed by parliament on the final day of the session, May 27, 1606.[16] Reports of the crushing measures soon to be enforced against " papists " spread throughout the land. The immediate reaction of the laity to the proclamation of the oath presented a variegated picture ranging from black despair through the dull gray of apprehensive bewilderment to the radiant hues of exultant heroism. Naturally enough the question of impending persecution figured prominently in the diplomatic correspondence of the time. Early in June the French ambassador informed his home office: "The poor Catholics . . . are still incredibly numerous, and are resolved for the most part to suffer anything rather than give up their religion."[17] Nevertheless, he added later, the harshness of the new laws came as a surprise to most of them and caused such widespread alarm that

---

[14] *Op. cit.*, Introduction, p. lii.

[15] *History of England, Principally in the 17th Century* (Oxford, 1875), I, 416.

[16] *Commons Journals*, I, 313.

> Many Catholics are preparing to go into exile, and among them some so old that I think they are seeking foreign shores merely to find there a peaceful grave. Yet it is an admirable thing to see the large numbers who are in no wise frightened by all the penalties. I could not have believed that so much fervor and zeal were still to be found in our religion.[18]

Boderie was still more surprised at some unexpected manifestations of religious vitality:

> So far are these Catholics from losing heart under the persecution that they seem to derive fresh strength and courage from it, and instead of Catholics who were known to be such renouncing their faith, others who were not known declare themselves openly every day.[19]

Apparently these sturdy resolutions wilted somewhat during the summer months. In his report of August 16, the Venetian ambassador described the heroic efforts being made by the majority of the clergy to stiffen the resistence of the weakening Catholic population: ". . . Still as the loss of property and ruin overhang those who refuse," he explained, "and as there are to be found some clerics who hold that in such dire distress the oath may be taken without jeopardizing the soul, it is thought that the greater number will submit to the necessity."[20]

[17] Boderie à Villeroy, *Les Ambassades* (Paris, 1750), I, 121.

[18] June 21, 1606, *ibid.*, I, 161.

[19] June 26, *ibid.*, I, 178.

[20] *Cal. S. P. Ven.*, X, 391. The growing irresoluteness of the laity was further indicated in Father Jones' letter to Robert Persons in October: "It is scarce credible what difficulty we have to keep up and underprop poor afflicted souls from ruin, and falling into errors and disorders, and all by reason of these late cruel laws." *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus during the 16th and 17th centuries*, ed. Henry Foley, S.J. (London, 1873-78), IV, 372.

This shift of opinion and resolution among lay Catholics requires some explanation. The pivotal agent was Archpriest George Blackwell. When one of Blackwell's assistants, Father John Mush, arrived in London shortly after the prorogation of parliament he found his confrères in a state of great perplexity about the recently enacted oath legislation and divided in their opinions as to whether Catholics could in good conscience pronounce the formula.[21] There followed a series of conferences with the archpriest, who persistently and vehemently opposed those who maintained that there must be some way of satisfying the demands of the government without compromising the principles of their faith.[22] Mush, Thomas Preston the Benedictine, Richard Holtby the Jesuit superior, and most of the others [*et plurimi*] supported Blackwell's contention that the oath could not be taken under any condition.

The assistant relates that he then endeavored to prevail upon Blackwell to send a delegation to Rome to obtain a decision from the Pope regarding this and other distressing problems, or at least to hold a conference composed of representatives of the secular clergy, the Jesuits, and the Benedictines in order to reach an agreement upon some prudent and uniform course of conduct which all would be bound to follow once it was adopted. But Blackwell refused to sanction either proposal, offering as an excuse the danger into which either project would precipitate him! Naturally the others were irritated by the flimsiness of this plea and protested that his safety would be in no greater jeopardy than their own. With the whole future of the Catholic Church in England hanging in the balance, they were willing to risk arrest and exile[23] for the sake of insuring a united front against a hostile government.

---

[21] His letter of July 11 is printed in Dodd's *Church History of England*, ed. Mark A. Tierney (London, 1839-43), IV, App. cxxxvi.

[22] Mush's narration agrees substantially with Father Blount's account. Cf. Foley, *Records*, I, 63-65. "He [Blackwell] has declared that it [the oath] was in no wise to be accepted, and had required a retractation from one of his assistants, a man of some weight, who, when consulted about the oath, had answered that it might safely be taken." *Ibid.*, VII, 979.

[23] The new statutes were not yet in effect, as Mush writes: "... nam ad primum Augusti, omnes libertatem discedendi habemus, et qui jam capiuntur ante illum diem, in exilium sunt ejiciendi." Tierney, *loc. cit.*

Then, with a suddenness which must have shocked and utterly disconcerted those who had spent so many hours parleying with him, Blackwell executed a complete *volte-face* and proceeded to defend the lawfulness of taking the oath just as vigorously as he had previously inveighed against it.[24] After much persuasion he relented on the question of a conference and summoned for the discussion three of his assistants, Bishop, Broughton, and Mush, together with Preston and Holtby. To this assembly the archpriest explained the reasons which had moved him to take his new stand:

> ... haec unica erat, quia sanctissimus non potest, rebus sic stantibus, regem deponere in edificationem, sed in destructionem, ideo jurare possumus illum nullam habere auctoritatem vel jurisdictionem deponendi regem ad destructionem, et id dicimur non posse, quod jure non possumus.[25]

Although the phrase containing the cardinal point in this line of reasoning scarcely admits of a literal translation, the sense is unmistakable: As the Church would be harmed rather than helped as a result of a pontifical declaration of deposition against the King, the Pope has not the power to depose him; hence we may swear that the Holy See has no such authority or jurisdiction. The writer of the letter confirms this interpretation when he relates that he, Holtby, and Preston, aligned themselves in the subsequent debate against Blackwell and the other two assistants, and held ". . . non licitum fore jurare 'illum non habere auctoritatem quia illam non potest convenienter exequi'."

Evidently the parley continued for some time, much to the annoyance of the archpriest, who was reluctant to hear any arguments contrary to his own views.[26] He and the two seculars contended throughout that their opinion could be safely followed in practice, while the others insisted that it was erroneous and prejudicial to the freedom and discipline of the Church. The conference finally dissolved with the opposing parties still unreconciled on the method of procedure. Perceiving the likelihood of a schism unless steps were immediately taken to obtain an authoritative pronouncement on the question, Mush and his colleagues at once referred the matter to Rome.

---

[24] "Tandem archipresbyter, qui aliorum omnium limitationes juramenti, et inventa judicata non improbabilia ad illud justificandum respuisset, subito mutatus erat, et tenuit quod absolute, et ut jacet, admitti poterat." *Ibid.*

[25] *Ibid.*

[26] Certe archipresbyter nihil audire voluit contra suam opinionem noviter conceptam; sed totum sicut illi placuit sic oportebat esse. *Ibid.*

Word spread rapidly through the city of London and its environs that the archpriest had sanctioned the taking of the oath, ". . . whereat," wrote Father Blount, " many do much marvel." [27] The three priests who stood in opposition at the conference now felt themselves obliged, for the sake of peace and unity, to explain the superior's attitude to those seeking their advice and to permit them to follow his opinion if they chose.

During the course of the next three days Blackwell was avalanched with reports that many of the secular clergy, all of the Benedictines and Jesuits, as well as a great number of the laity stoutly refused to accept his interpretation of the oath. Deeply impressed by this reaction, he decided it would be better for the Catholics to refrain from pronouncing the formula until the Pope's verdict had arrived.[28] But owing to peculiar circumstances the archpriest's decision was announced too late to counteract appreciably the effects produced by his original statement. Already the Catholic citizens who had come to London to attend the Trinity session of the law courts were on their way home spreading the first report throughout the length and breadth of the land.[29]

Without doubt the coincidence of Blackwell's first declaration with the conclusion of the Trinity term goes far to explain why many Catholics, particularly those living in the more isolated sections of the country, submitted to the oath without hesitation when

[27] Foley, *op. cit.*, I, 63.

[28] Ipse, sacerdotes multos, benedictinos omnes et jesuitas, cum multis laicis, a juramento in hoc sensu abhorrere, comperiens, voluit post tres dies homines retinere ne illud admitterent, donec aliquod supra hoc ub urbe accepisset. Tierney, *op. cit.*, IV, App. cxxxvii.

[29] Sed nimis tarde admonitio haec ad illud revocandum, quod tanquam licitum primo divulgaverat, et jam per totum regnum dispersum erat per eos qui ad terminum venerant; ista enim sub ipsius termini fine evenerunt. *Ibid.*

it was first administered to them. Three important factors are discernible in support of this conclusion. First, such people as were in doubt about their duty would naturally be inclined to accept the report of the archpriest's decision as final and to shape their conduct accordingly; even those who had determined not to take the oath would be strongly influenced to change their resolution and protect themselves against the heavy penalties. Furthermore, Catholics had to exercise considerable caution in using what poor means of communication were available at the time in circulating information about the reversed decision, which, incidentally, many would be slow to believe. Finally, it appears that Blackwell took no official steps to notify his people of his new plan. In a letter written to Robert Persons in Rome on October 30, Father Holtby remarked:

> The customer [code name for Blackwell] doth now insinuate unto his friends that his opinion is contradicted, and excuseth his error: yet doth he not apprehend it so sensitively that he thinketh himself bound to reveal it, though it hath caused an exceeding scandal, and will do still until the breve come: until which time he will rest quiet. Wherefore we do hope to hear of it soon.[30]

The anxiously awaited brief of Paul V must have arrived shortly after the above letter was written.[31] In it the Pope declared that Catholics could not lawfully take the oath because it contained "many things contrary to faith and salvation." The Jesuit superior, Holtby, who had sent a copy of the oath formula to Rome immediately after its publication, seems to have been the first to have received an authentic copy of the papal document.[32] He handed it over at once to the archpriest, who showed it to a few of his friends but, despite insistent urging by the other priests, refused to promulgate it, assigning as an excuse his unwillingness to thrust his head into a halter deliberately.[33]

---

[30] Tierney, *op. cit.*, IV, App. cxl. Some harsh criticisms have been leveled at Blackwell for his lack of courage and stability. These do not seem to be altogether justified in view of his advanced age (seventy) and poor health, a result of years of toil in the difficult English mission.

[31] Dated at Rome, September 22, 1606.

[32] Henry More, S.J., *Historia Missionis Anglicanae Societatis Jesu, 1580-1619* (St. Omer, 1660), p. 345.

Through its espionage system the government obtained possession of a copy of Paul's brief[34] and the Catholic population daily expected a crushing enforcement of the new penal code. However, week after week went by and the hammer did not fall. The most likely explanation of this phenomenal inactivity appears to be that Archbishop Bancroft had induced the King to hold the laws in suspension until he could prevail upon a sufficiently large number of the secular clergy, with some of whom he was in secret but constant contact, to approve the oath, hoping thereby to influence the laity to fall submissively into line. Such tactics fit perfectly into the preserved pattern of Canterbury's strategy.

The thin thread which held the sword of Damocles was severed early in the following year. That the missionaries succeeded in persuading many to stand firm in their allegiance to the Holy See is evidenced by such reports as the following: "Ten members of one family have refused the oath; many others have done the same. Many who had fallen away have been restored, and have girded themselves anew for the conflict."[35] Bancroft endeavored to counter this effort by inducing the distraught archpriest to write to his clergy: "I persuade myself that you, my assistants and dear brethren, will take the oath as I have done, and that you will instruct the lay Catholics that they may do so when it is offered to them."[36] It is not surprising, then, to read in Gustinian's dispatch of August 1, 1607:

---

[33] Blackwell made this statement during the course of his examination before Archbishop Bancroft and a panel of Anglican bishops at Lambeth Palace in the following summer. The proceedings of the trial were edited by one of the bishops, probably Lancelot Andrewes, and published in London in 1607. The Latin version is printed in *Monarchiae Sancti Romani Imperii,* ed. Melchior Goldast (Frankfort, 1668), III, 567-612.

[34] *Ibid.*, III, 570.

[35] 1607 *Annual Letter*, Foley, *op. cit.*, VII, 983.

[36] Goldast, *Monarchiae*, III, 571.

> The Catholics here are in a flutter since the archpriest has taken the oath of supremacy [i. e., allegiance] and has exhorted others to do the same, a step that is directly contrary to the brief which was addressed to the English Catholics. Everyone is in doubt about the matter, the more so as another imprisoned priest has refused.[37]

Throughout the greater part of the reign the unfortunate lay Catholics were ground between the wheels of duty and fear. Their distressing situation was epitomized by Boderie in a stark phrase: "Voilà tous ces pauvres gens en grands hazards, les uns de l'ame les autres du corps."[38] Though their consciences may have dictated an uncompromising stand against the oath, especially after the missionaries had made known the Pope's condemnation of it, still they had the example of some of the clergy as well as the terrifying alternative of escaping with what few possessions they could carry to a foreign land or surrendering everything and spending the rest of their days in prison.

Under such formidably adverse circumstances, the surprising thing was not that many succumbed to state pressure, but rather that so great a number resisted every form of coercion brought to bear upon them by a remorseless government. This was particularly true during the six year period following the enactment of fresh penal legislation in 1610. From that time until negotiations were under way for the marriage of Prince Charles to the Spanish Infanta practically no respite was given to the harrassed Catholics of England.

The tocsin ushering in the "Reign of Terror" came in the form of a royal proclamation issued June 2, 1610. Its contents are summarized in the discursive title:

> A proclamation for the due execution of all former laws against recusants, giving them a day to repair to their dwellings, and not afterward to come to the court, or within ten miles of London without special license; and disarming them as the law requireth; and withal, that all Priests and Jesuits shall depart the land by a day, no more to return into the realm; and for administering the oath of allegiance according to the law.[39]

---

[37] *Cal. S. P. Ven.*, XI, 20.

[38] *Ambassades*, III, 227.

[39] Printed in Tierney, *op. cit.*, IV, App. clxxxiv-clxxxvii.

A statute framed for the express purpose of putting teeth into this decree was immediately passed by parliament. Captioned "An Acte for administeringe the Oath of Allegiance and Reformacion of married Women Recusants",[40] the measure provided that the oath must be taken ". . . by all and every person and persons, as well as Ecclesiastical as Temporall, of what Estate, Dignitie, Preheminence, Sexe, Qualitie, or degree soever hee she or they be or shalbe, above the Age of Eighteene yeeres." This time no exemption was made in favor of the noble classes as had been done in 1606. They were specified in profuse detail and the penalty of *praemunire* was to be inflicted upon them as upon all others who refused to submit within six months after the passage of the bill.

No time was lost in carrying out the new prescriptions. On the very day the royal decree was published James "caused the oath to be administered to his Privy Council in his own Presence; and gave order, that the like should be done to all Persons within his palace."[41] All government officials in high as well as low positions, professional men and students, records the contemporary, Edmund Howes, were obliged to follow suit.[42] Even those in the lower ranks of society were not overlooked. The same chronicler tells us that the members of the Upper House "ministered the same oth unto all their servants and followers; and those that refused to take this oth were put from their Lords services."[43]

Judging from the parliamentary *Journals* very few Catholics sought election to the Lower House during James's reign. Apart

[40] 7 Jac. I, c. 6, *Statutes of the Realm,* IV, 1162-64.

[41] *Commons Journals,* I, 435.

[42] "Presently after this Proclamation, the oth of allegeance was administered unto all Officers, Barretures, Atturnies and Clarkes, belonging to any Courts of Westminster Hall, the Exchequer, and Court of Requests, and also unto all Doctors of the Lawes, Advocats and Proctours of the Spiritual Courts; this oath was also ministered unto all other sorts of Lawyers, as students in the Innes of Court and Chancery, and unto all students and Schollers in both the Universities." *Annales or a general chronicle of England* (London, 1631), p. 312. A typical procedure is given in the *Records of Lincoln Inn, Black Books,* II, 132. Some members were "expelled out of this Societie" for refusal. *Ibid.,* II, 220, 362.

[43] Howes, *loc. cit.*

from the fact that their chances of success were meager, the principal deterrent was probably the House requirement that all members receive communion in an Anglican church.[44] However, this obligation was not based on any statute and was not infrequently disregarded. Furthermore, although the oath was administered at the beginning of every session, it was not altogether impossible for Catholics to occupy their seats without making formal submission. Thus in 1610 it was only after twenty members had simply repeated the formula which was read by the clerk that someone questioned the legality of such procedure.[45] After some discussion it was decided " that it may be understood that it is lawfully administered," though some remained dubious. At a later session Pym observed that " in the tumult and confusion of the first daie, soe manie being sworne together, Divers did escape without taking the Oathe at all."[46] Apparently one of these was Sir Joseph Leedes, elected for Hindon, Wilts, for when he was challenged later he refused to take the oath and was obliged to forfeit his seat.[47] When Sir Thomas Gerrard, a prominent Catholic elected for Liverpool in 1624, likewise refused, he was arrested and thrown into prison.[48]

The question of the nobility's reaction to the imposition of the oath offers a striking example of how errors are introduced into the stream of historical writing by reputable scholars and thereafter accepted on their authority as accurate presentations of the actual facts. Summing up the general Catholic reaction in a single pregnant paragraph, Lingard wrote:

> On the one hand, the oath was refused by the majority of those to whom it was tendered; on the other, it was taken by many of

---

[44] A. G. and Edw. Porritt, *The Unreformed Houes of Commons* (Cambridge, 1903), I, 131.

[45] *Parliamentary Debates in 1610*, ed. S. R. Gardiner (London, 1861), p. 50.

[46] " Diary of John Pym," *The Commons Debates for 1621*, ed. Wallace Notestein *et al.* (New Haven, 1935), IV, 34-35.

[47] "Anonymous Journal ", *ibid.*, II, 53.

[48] *Commons Journals*, I, 680; *The Court and Times of Charles the First*, ed. R. F. Williams (London, 1848), I, 58.

> considerable weight among the clergy and laity. Among the latter are to be numbered the Catholic peers (they amounted to more than twenty), who, with a single exception, spontaneously took the oath on different occasions in the upper house of parliament. [Then in a note:] This will appear from a diligent perusal of the journals. The lord Teynham alone eluded it, by never attending his duty in parliament more than one day during each session.[49]

As a matter of fact, "a diligent perusal of the journals" reveals quite the contrary. Fortunately not only the names of those in attendance are specified at the end of each day's minutes in the *Lords Journals,* but also the names of those who subscribed to the oath.

To begin with Lord Teynham. His initial entry into parliament was made on January 30, 1621. Although he was present every day that sessions were held until the following June 4, his name does not appear among those who took the oath. In fact, while he was absent for a few days in 1625, possibly owing to illness, his attendance was exceptionally regular from the time of his first appearance until the end of 1626.[50]

It is impossible to estimate the exact number of Catholic lords under James I not merely because of the incompleteness of the records but also because of the inaccuracies contained in those which have been preserved.[51] However, of the twenty "definitely Catholic" peers in 1606 listed in Charles Butler's *Historical Memoirs,*[52] eight subscribed sometime during the session of 1610 and seven others did the same between this time and 1626. Lord Lumley was present in 1610, though his name does not appear thereafter. There is no evidence in the *Journals* that the other four, Shrewsberry, Herbert, Worcester, and Darcie, took the oath.

---

[49] *History of England* (London, 5th ed., 1849), VII, 97-98. The substance of Lingard's statement has often been repeated, sometimes with aknowledgment (Pastor, *Lives of the Popes,* English trans., XXVI, 179), more often without it (Taunton, *English Jesuits,* p. 356).

[50] I did not go beyond this date in the *Journals* as further research, in this instance, seems to be unnecessary.

[51] All available evidence points to the fact that they must have formed a fairly strong minority. Cf., e. g., *Cal. S. P. Ven.,* XI, 210.

[52] *Op. cit.,* I, 296-298.

Teynham was not included in Butler's list, nor was Lord Scroope who refused the oath and is mentioned under date of May 20, 1624, among "Such Persons as are certified to have Places of Charge or Trust in their several Counties, and are themselves Popish Recusants, or that are reported or suspected to be." [53]

A few examples may be adduced to show that many who finally agreed to take the oath by no means did so "spontaneously". "The Lord Vaux was lately committed to the Fleet from the council-table for refusing the oath of allegiance," wrote Chamberlain to Carleton in March, 1612, "and is like enough to follow his mother's fortune in the *praemunire*." [54] In May he was condemned and imprisoned in King's Bench.[55] Seemingly, the entreaties of influential friends brought a mitigation of his punishment, for in the following October it was reported: "Lord Vaux is pardoned of the *praemunire* and delivered out of the Fleet or King's Bench to the custody of the Dean of Westminster, to see what good may be done with him." [56] Despite the efforts made to influence him Vaux did not capitulate until February 9, 1626.

Early in the session of 1624 four Catholic lords were expelled from the House for their persistent refusal to submit to the oath.[57] Three of these men, Morley, Arundel, and Montacute, pronounced the formula before the end of the session, but Rutland held out for over two years.

So much for those in privileged positions. Now to consider the question of how the Catholic masses fared during the "Reign of Terror". Father George Birkhead, who was appointed in 1608 to succeed the incarcerated Blackwell,[58] wrote to one of his assistants in Rome on July 2, 1610: "This new oath is so pressed by the King that it causeth many to stagger."[59] The Venetian ambassador confirmed this report in the following December: "They are proceeding against the Catholics with unusual rigor. The oath is being administered everywhere, especially to recusants."[60] Not all of the official court records pertaining to this period have been preserved and even those which are extant are not accessible at the present time because of the war. Such extracts as have been published, though often distressingly sketchy, do offer abundant verification of the statements made by the two witnesses quoted above and corroborated by many other missionaries.

---

[53] *Lords Journals*, II, 394.

[54] *The Court and Times of James I*, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1849), I, 136. "On Friday, Mrs. Vaux, the Lord Vaux's mother, was called at the sessions at Newgate and there for refusing that oath, was condemned in a *praemunire*, to lose all her goods and lands during her life, and to perpetual imprisonment." *Ibid.*

[55] Same to same, *Ibid.*, I, 168.

[56] *Ibid.*, I, 199.

[57] *Diary of Walter Yonge, M.P., 1604-1628*, ed. George Roberts (London, 1847), p. 73.

At the March sessions of gaol delivery in 1612 twenty-two Catholics were confined in Newgate prison, having been tried and condemned to *praemunire* for refusing the oath.[61] Eleven other prisoners, registered as "Recusant papists", appear to have been committed for the same offence though not yet convicted.[62] In the following year all of these people were still lodged in Newgate and their number had been increased by seven.[63] While the *Middlesex County Records* are equally incomplete, they offer this advantage that from them some idea can be gained of the proportion of Catholics who steadfastly refused to submit to those who, after indictment and imprisonment, subsequently took the oath and were released. For the five year period, 1609-1614, nineteen refusals and ten submissions are listed.[64]

---

[58] The original transcript of appointment is preserved in the State Paper Office and is printed in Tierney, *op. cit.*, IV, clvii-clix, App. The new archpriest was directed to admonish the clergy of the illiceity of taking the oath or of advising others to do so and he was authorized to deprive of their faculties all priests who after a reasonable lapse of time refused to obey.

[59] Tierney, *op. cit.*, IV, App. clxv.

[60] *Cal. S. P. Ven.*, XII, 86.

[61] *London Sessions Records, 1605-1685*, ed. Hugh Bowler, O.S.B., *Cath. Rec. Soc. Pub.*, XXXIV, 68. This is the best edited set of sessions records published to date.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 68, note 4. *The Middlesex County Records,* ed. J. C. Jeaffreson (London, 1688-92), II, 216, show that six of these were indicted in the preceding July for refusing the oath.

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 86. Eight of the total number were women.

Evidently the majority of Catholics in Nottinghamshire who were challenged with the oath preferred to take the penalties rather than violate their consciences:

> There are *many* records of persons being committed to the Common Gaol until they shall take the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, and for "refusing" and "denying" to take such oath. There are *several* records of persons attending in court and voluntarily taking the Oath of Allegiance.[65]

Regarding the enforcement of the oath in Devonshire the following statement is made:

> In the calenders after this time, i. e., 1608 there are *many* instances of persons imprisoned for *praemunire*. This, of course, generally meant refusing the oath of allegiance ... It became a test of loyalty as well as religion, and seems to have been tendered with much impartiality to any who had given cause for suspicion by absence from church or otherwise.[66]

The general picture formed from an examination of the variety of contemporary records reveals some striking facts. One of these is that the oath was imposed with much greater rigor in southern sections of the country than in the north, where Catholics were considerably stronger. It appears, too, that the common folk were made to feel the pressure of the law much more severely than their wealthier and more powerful co-religionists. The following report, written in 1612 and addressed to Lord Chancellor Ellesmere, presents a typical illustration of the thoroughness with which government officials administered the oath in the south:

---

[64] Jeaffreson, *op. cit.*, II, 42, 48, 68, 70, 163, 209, 215, 216, 217. Three others are given in *Middlesex County Records 1612-1616*, ed. Wm. le Hardy (London, 1935-37), I, 42; II, 30.

[65] *Nottinghamshire County Records, Notes and Extracts of the 17th century*, ed. Henry H. Copnall (Nottingham, 1915), pp. 106, 132.

[66] *Quarter Sessions of Devonshire from Queen Elizabeth to Queen Anne*, ed. A. H. Hamilton (London, 1878), p. 78. All of the other published county records have been investigated, but it seems needless to itemize them, as the evidence uniformly substantiates that already given.

> Maie it please your Lopp. to be advertized that sithence the letters from your Lopp. and the Lord of Canterburies Grace, I, with the Justices of the division beyond Oxon, went to Sir Francis Stoners howse, wher his Ladie, the Ladie Lentall his daughter, Mrs. Crouch his sister and the Ladie Lentalls woman, refused to take the othe of allegeance, and thereupon we committed them all to prison. From thence we went to Henrie Stonner, sonne and heir of Sir Francis Stonner (his Ladie being a recusant convicted): her husband told us that shee was gone, because shee would not take the othe of allegeance. From thence wee went to Mr. Symonds, a man of great estate, whose wieffe being a recusant convicted, he answered us, that his wieffe was gone before our coming, for she would not take the othe. From thence Sir George Tipping and myselfe went to Mr. Belson (hee and his wieffe being recusants convicted); he being not at home, his wieffe, his mother, the wieffe of one Mr. Lovett and one Mrs. Belson, an auncient mayde, all of them refused to take the othe of allegeance, whereupon we committed them. From thence Mr. Brome and I went to Mr. Powells Howse, a man of good estate (his wieffe being a recusant convicted), shee likewise was gone before our comeing (as her husband told us) for that she would not take the othe of allegeance.[67]

For a brief period after the enactment of the oath legislation officials in some northern areas were prompt in carrying out its prescriptions. Thus in September, 1607, the Bishop of Durham informed King James that he had summoned more than twenty noted recusants, of whom six took the oath at once, a few others promised to take it, and the rest were undecided.[68] The following year in Yorkshire it was reported that "Thirty persons have been stripped of their goods and condemned to imprisonment for life for refusing this oath."[69] Subsequently, however, the justices became so remiss in their duty that they were frequently called to task by the judges of assize.[70]

Repeated reprimands finally stirred local officials to action. In

---

[67] *Egerton Papers*, ed. John P. Collier (London, 1840), pp. 453-4. The writer, one Thomas Chamberlayne, later became a judge.

[68] *Original Letters on Ecclesiastical Affairs in Scotland, 1603-25*, ed. Beriah Botfield (Edinburgh, 1851), I, 111-113.

[69] 1608 *Annual Letter*, Foley, *op. cit.*, VII, 990.

[70] Cf., e. g., *Manchester Sessions: Notes of proceedings before Oswald Mosley, 1616-1630, and other magistrates*, ed. Ernest Axon (Manchester, 1901), pp. 49, 57, 82.

Manchester, for instance, fifty-five Catholics, practically all common folk, were indicted in 1620. Of these only six took the oath and were released.[71]

The practice of dealing extremely harshly with the heads of prominent families for the purpose of intimidating others in the household and neighborhood was exemplified in the case of the Vavasours. The father, Walter, " an old gentleman who, for his ancient family, was counted the chief in the county, his ancestors, together with the Percys, having been builders of York Minster," died in prison where he had been confined for refusing the oath.[72] Shortly afterward his son, William, was jailed in Newgate for the same offense.[73] His petition for a composition of £ 700 in lieu of the sequestration of his property was refused.[74] Four years later he was still a prisoner though apparently his health was giving way before the rigors of confinement. In the *Privy Council Register* under date of June 9, 1616, the following entry appears:

> William Vavasor, a gentleman of Yorkshire, convicted of a *praemunire* for refusing the oath of allegiance . . . in respect of his desease of body and decay of his poore estate, his humble suite is to be confined within the county of Yorke, where the said Vavasor may remain confined according to the Statute in that behalfe.[75]

Contemporary records contain many instances of women being compelled to undergo inhuman suffering as a result of the oath legislation. Not infrequently wives whose husbands were not Catholics saw their families utterly disrupted because they held firm to their religious convictions. Chamberlain even relates how one woman, driven to insanity by her husband's relentless insistence that she submit and " have her children otherwise educated," took their lives and was herself condemned to death.[76] Even in the court room they were at times subjected to the grossest indignities, as a report written in 1610 illustrates:

---

[71] *Ibid.*, p. 83.

[72] " Father Pollard's Recollections of the Yorkshire Mission, 1610 ", printed in John Morris, S.J., *The Troubles of Our Catholic Forefathers Related by Themselves* (London, 1877), III, 458-9.

[73] *London Sessions Records, C. R. S.*, XXXIII, 71. A copy of his indictment is printed *ibid.*, 384-5.

[74] *June 19, 1612,* Lansdowne MSS, 153, f. 86.

[75] II, 513. Whether this plea was granted or not is not indicated.

[76] Letter to Carleton Birch, *op. cit.*, I, 404.

> There dwelled in Lincolnshire two women, the one married and the other unmarried. The one having her kinsman, and the other her father, prisoners in York for their religion, went to visit them. As soon as they entered the prison, search came, to know that and who they were; and being found to be Catholics, they were carried before the mayor, who with his wise company offered them presently the oath of allegiance; which when they refused, as not knowing what it meant, they were both committed to the prison to which they came. The one escaped, to wit, the married woman; but the maid remained, and at the assize, was brought before Sir Edward Phillips, the judge, who (coming to the hall of the city after dinner well tippled, as it was observed) called the poor maid before him, and in most shameless manner reviled her, calling her all the leud names of whore, drab, quean, which he could devise; asked the alderman if he should not hang her; and at length condemned her in the praemunire, and committed her to perpetual imprisonment, where she yet remains and is likely to continue.[78]

Rarely were the customary harsh penalties lightened in favor of the aged and infirm. Thus Father Mush wrote in 1611: "Mine own brother and sister, aged folks almost seventy, are condemned to perpetual imprisonment and have suffered utter shipwreck of lands and goods for refusing this oath." [78] In the "Jesuit Annual Letter of 1614" a number of such cases are recorded.[79] As might be expected, the rigors of prison life often hastened the death of those detained.

[77] Stonyhurst MSS, Ang. A, iii, 100. Printed in Tierney, *op. cit.*, IV, 167. Many other pathetic cases are given *ibid.* IV, 160-179.

[78] Tierney, *op. cit.*, IV, App. clxxviii.

[79] Foley, *Records*, VII, 1033-1074. *E. g.*, "We know a lady eighty years of age who, to save her bail was forced to travel in the depth of winter more than eighty miles. She refused the oath, making open profession of her faith, and in consequence lost all her property, and was condemned to perpetual imprisonment." *Ibid.*, VII, 1040. In the following year the Protestant author, Thomas Helwys, referring to the recusants, wrote in his *Persecution for Religion Judged and Condemned*, ed. E. B. Underhill (London, 1864): "If they will not take the said oath, they are to be in *praemunire*, as is at large in the statute declared, and as is daily practiced with papists." P. 138.

Although there were probably cases which have not been recorded, it is certain that during the ten year period from 1607 to 1616 thirteen Catholics lost their lives as a result of the oath legislation. In some instances refusal to take the oath was the principal or sole charge; in every case the condemned person was promised a remission of the death penalty if he would pronounce the prescribed formula.[80] Government officials justified capital punishment: " For such recusants who refuse the oath are dangerous, in as much as the Pope has condemned those who accept the oath." [81]

There is abundant evidence to show that submission to the oath did not always, or even usually, bring relief from other penalties. Members of the House of Commons who pronounced the formula were further required to take the oath of supremacy and receive communion in an Anglican church. In his recent study Brian Magee demonstrates that " swearers " were not exempt from recusancy fines.[82] Furthermore, the government was not satisfied with a single act of submission but required that the oath be taken repeatedly, though this often entailed great inconvenience and suffering. In the official records such entries as the following are not uncommon:

> Memorandum that at the Courthouse in Westminster, Richard Abbington gentleman, a popish recusant, being tendered the Othe of Allegiaunce, refuseth to take the same, for that he allegeth that he has already taken the othe three yeeres synthe before the Bishop of Hereford, and will not nowe take it bycause he will not shewe that president to others of his profession, yet at that time he took the oath againe.[83]

And the justice of the peace at Honiton, who certainly had first hand evidence of law enforcement, recorded in his diary: " 1612. About the beginning of this year the Pope sent an inhibition to all his Catholics in England that they should not take the oath of allegiance; whereupon all were sworn anew and many refused."[84]

---

[80] Cf. Howell's *State Trials*, II, and Challoner's *Memoirs*, II, *passim*.

[81] *Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham, Master of Requests, 1593-1616*, ed. H. S. Scott (London, 1902), p. 98.

[82] *The English Recusants* (London, 1938), pp. 37-54, 61-80.

[83] *Middlesex County Records*, II, 68.

Further evidence is contained in a contemporary account of the hardships which not only those who refused the oath but also those who took it were compelled to undergo in 1614:

> Coke [i. e. Chief Justice Sir Edward Coke] being well aware that they comply reluctantly and against their conscience, summons them to London to renew the oath, in some cases as many as four times a year. Hence it happens that these poor creatures have to travel, some of them, from two to six hundred miles in the depth of winter, and as often in the summer season, encountering the perils of the road, having to wait the convenience of the judges, and to fee at no small cost the officials and underlings of the Courts; to return home with a wounded conscience, and to be bound by pledges most intolerable to men of gentle birth. For not content with these high handed proceedings, Coke compels them under most grievous penalties to give bail for their good behaviour.[85]

It was provided in the statutes that one-third of the forfeiture made by Catholics who refused the oath was to be paid to the person who first brought information to the justices. The generic term applied to these informers, many of whom operated in Catholic circles as " fifth columnists ", was " pursuivants ". A vast network of these petty officials was spread over the country to ferret out suspected Catholics. That they were highly effective is clear from the numerous complaints made about them in the letters and reports of the missionaries. Thus Birkhead informed his agent in Rome:

> The pursuivants, by apprehending priests and catholics, are grown so rich that they hire spies to serve their turn, in so much as there is not a host, chamberlain, or ostler which is not ready to inform them of the behaviour of their guests. If they see a man modest and civil, it is enough to set the pursuivant upon him, who finding him to be a catholic, they begin to examine and threaten to carry him to the bishop

---

[84] *Diary of Walter Yonge*, p. 23.

[85] *Annual Letter*, Foley, *op. cit.*, VII, 1040-1041. In 1615 it was reported: "Coke, according to his wont, is ever tendering the oath. He is said to have summoned to this time 16,000 Catholics on that account." *Ibid.*, VII, 1096.

> of Canterbury to take the oath; which terrifieth them so much that they yield to some composition; and so it cometh to pass that these catchpoles are becoming exceedingly rich.[86]

While wealthier Catholics were the more usual prey of these extortioners, the poorer classes felt their depredations most acutely. Armed with fictitious or out-of-date warrants the agents frequently invaded private homes and carried off whatever moveable property happened to attract their cupidity.[87] It is not difficult, then, to put credence in Father Worthington's statement made in October, 1616: " It is incredible to how great distress some Catholics are reduced. Men of rank who formerly supported six or seven priests are now almost struggling with extreme poverty." [88]

A mass of corroborative evidence is available to show beyond any question that the oath legislation actually was enforced, and with great rigor. However, it seems that sufficient testimony has been advanced to bear out this assertion and the presentation of further proof would be too repetitious. In conclusion it should be noted that Catholics who refused to take the Jacobean oath uniformly protested their loyalty to the King and expressed their readiness to pronounce any formula from which the obnoxious clauses had been removed.

CLARENCE J. RYAN

Marquette University

---

[86] Tierney, *op. cit.*, IV, App. clxvi.

[87] *Ibid.*, IV, 162-7; Foley, *Records*, II, 413 and ff. Their methods were execrated by the very government officials under whom they served. Cf. *Diary of Walter Yonge*, p. 18.

[88] Foley, *op. cit.*, II, 98.

BISHOP SPALDING'S WORK ON THE ANTHRACITE COAL STRIKE COMMISSION *

JOHN LANCASTER SPALDING, Bishop of Peoria, Illinois, from 1877 to 1908, was thoroughly American, highly cultured, and enthusiastically devoted to the furthering of any work leading to the good of the Church, his country, or his fellowman, but his activity was always that of the promoter, and the consequence is that, in general, when he is remembered at all it is only as the writer of a few books of essays which have been allowed to go out of print and as the "great bishop of a small city." While it is recognized that he was a scholar and a philosopher of education, few know that he was eminently practical in all his teaching or that he was in any way responsible for the success of the Catholic Educational Exhibit at the World's Columbian Exposition or for the establishment of the Catholic University of America. Even students of history have almost forgotten that he was actively interested in western colonization and that, as a member of the Anthracite Coal Strike Commission of 1902, he exerted a markedly helpful influence, particularly in the preparation of the *Report,* the "final award that is frequently looked upon by the anthracite coal mine workers as the bill of their industrial rights."[1]

The history of the Great Strike of 1902 and of President Roosevelt's determined and successful effort to break what by October had developed into "the most serious deadlock in the history of the country in times of peace"[2] is told in detail by Dr. W. J. Walsh in his scholarly and intensely interesting study, *The United Mine Workers of America as an Economic and Social Force in the Anthracite Territory.* But there and elsewhere, in records that have come down to us, references to Bishop Spalding, if made at all, are brief and unsatisfactory. The Bishop's habitual reticence regarding anything that concerned himself is probably the chief cause of this, but since practically every contemporary newspaper comment on the Commission indicates that special interest was felt in him, it seemed worth the trouble to try to discover what part he personally took in the work and to what extent his influence directed or affected its progress.

---

*Paper read at the Twenty-Second Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, December 29, 1941, Chicago. In 1929, when the writer undertook to make an intensive study of Bishop Spalding's influence in the Church and outside of it, she had the good fortune to be able to talk at length with each of the four surviving members of the Anthracite Coal Strike Commission of 1902-1903: Mr. Clark and Dr. Neill of Washington, Mr. Parker of Philadelphia, and Mr. Watkins of New York. Each one spoke gratefully and enthusiastically about Bishop Spalding. All regretted that the story of the Commission and its work had never been fully written.

[1] W. J. Walsh, *The United Mine Workers of America as an Economic and Social Force in the Anthracite Territory,* p. 122.

[2] *Harper's Weekly,* XLVI (October, 1902), p. 1530.

The Strike marked a turning-point in the history of organized Labor because, while it is true that the miners were asking for better wages, hours, and working conditions, the real struggle was over the right of Labor, through certified representatives, to confer with representatives of Industry and thereby make agreements and sign contracts embodying terms applicable to all.

For five months the mining operators, led by Mr. George F. Baer, president of several mining and railway companies, refused every request of John Mitchell, President of the United Mine Workers of America, for a conference, ignored every attempt on the part of influential persons to bring about a settlement, and throughout the summer and early fall firmly resisted all President Roosevelt's efforts to induce them to discuss terms with the workers through their representatives in the United Mine Workers Union.

Finally, in October, through the influence of J. Pierpont Morgan, they agreed to submit their differences to arbitration, provided a board of a type specified by themselves were appointed by the President to hear and pass on the questions at issue. The composition of this board was to be as follows:

1. An officer of the engineer corps of the United States.
2. An expert mining engineer.
3. One of the judges of the United States courts of the eastern district of Pennsylvania.
4. A man who by active participation in mining and selling coal is familiar with the physical and commercial features of the business.
5. A man of prominence, eminent as a sociologist.[3]

---

[3] *Report of the Anthracite Coal Strike of 1902,* p. 11.

The following story of the formation and work of this Commission is based almost exclusively on current newspaper articles and on the account as given directly by Mr. E. W. Parker, the expert mining engineer chosen, by Mr. Thomas H. Watkins, the man experienced in the mining and selling of coal, by Mr. E. E. Clark, who was finally listed as the eminent sociologist, and by Dr. Charles P. Neill, the official recorder of the Commission. From these sources and from the few books that make mention of the event we learn that while the appointing of Messrs. Parker and Watkins, and of Brigadier General James M. Wilson and Judge George Gray was accepted by all as satisfactory, an interesting and rather amusing struggle arose over the naming of the " eminent sociologist ". This resulted from the request made by President Mitchell that the Commission include a representative of Labor and a prominent ecclesiastic, and the fact that President Roosevelt admitted the reasonableness of the request and decided to grant it.

It was not difficult to find in Mr. Clark a representative labor man who would meet with the approval of all concerned. At that time he was serving his sixth term as Grand Chief of the Order of Railroad Conductors, and the mining operators, in their position of railroad presidents had been accustomed to deal with him and were known to have great confidence in his probity and intelligence.[4] Moreover, the President had already considered him for an arbitration board, together with Carroll D. Wright, U. S. Commissioner of Labor, Grover Cleveland, John D. Kernan of New York, and Marvin Hughett of Chicago. The difficulty lay in inducing the operators to consent to the appointment of a labor man at all. As for the prominent ecclesiastic and the eminent sociologist, that too, so far as Mr. Roosevelt was concerned, was easy of settlement. He did not know Bishop Spalding personally, but he had read his sociological essays with such interest and sympathy that he had been heard to declare that he would like much to meet the author.[5] No doubt, also, much concerning the Bishop's qualifications and activities was known to him from general sources. But the immediate cause of his deciding upon the Bishop of Peoria rather than his friend, Archbishop Ireland, or an ecclesiastic of the anthracite region, Bishop Hoban of Scranton or Archbishop Ryan of Philadelphia, must be traced to President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University.

---

[4] Interview with T. H. Watkins, May, 1929.

[5] *New York Tribune*, October 17, 1902.

The correspondence that passed between the President and the Bishop at this time[6] gives no information as to why the latter had been placed on the list. Many conjectured reasons are to be found in newspaper and periodical articles of the time and in books that mention the subject, all without foundation in fact that could be substantiated. The only comment of the Bishop's on the appointment that could be recalled by any of the priests and relatives that were consulted was that the President had told him that the suggestion had come from President Butler, and the latter corroborated the statement in the following communication:

> The late Bishop Spalding of Peoria was a very dear and a very close friend of mine. I visited him several times at his home in Peoria and had the great honor as President of Columbia University of conferring upon him the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws at the Commencement of 1902. I greatly admired Bishop Spalding's religious nature, spirit and influence, his eloquence in the pulpit and on the platform, as well as the beauty of his literary style whether in prose or in verse . . . For many years we saw as much of each other as circumstances and our duties in different parts of the country would permit.
>
> It was my good fortune to be the intimate friend and personal adviser of Theodore Roosevelt during the most important and constructive years of his public life. While he was Governor of New York he himself had a sufficient personal acquaintance with public men in the State to know where to look when he needed counsel, advice, or administrative assistance. At the beginning of his national political service he did not have so wide an acquaintance with the public men of the nation. Very early in his administration I offered him a series of suggestions of men of the highest competence and disinterestedness who might from time to time be called upon for counsel and administrative assistance, but who were not seekers for public office and who would not be likely to accept it. Among the names I suggested then was that of Bishop Spalding, and I enlarged upon his character, his elevation of mind and of spirit, and his influence. My suggestion was

---

[6] *Roosevelt Papers*, Library of Congress Archives.

> that Bishop Spalding might well be called upon for counsel and service in anything that related to the consideration and solution of social problems, quite apart from politics.
>
> My distinct recollection is that Mr. Roosevelt, then living in a small house on the west side of Franklin Square, while the White House was under repair, talked over with me the composition of the Commission which you name, and that on my suggesting Bishop Spalding for membership upon it, he exclaimed: " What you have said to me about that man interests me greatly. I believe he is just the man we want." [7]

Bishop Spalding at that time had just published his address on " Labor and Capital," in which he gave evidence of a rare appreciation and understanding of the position and problems of both laborer and capitalist. He closed his discourse with a strong plea for the cessation of universal competition and for the development of such co-operation of all with all as alone could lead to the realization of the highest hopes for America.[8] A man who, in those years of bitter strife between Capital and Labor, could look at the whole situation fairly and dispassionately would surely have an invaluable contribution to make to the work of the proposed Commission. So thought President Butler and President Roosevelt, and events proved that they were right.

Having selected Mr. Clark and Bishop Spalding, President Roosevelt now had to make sure that his choice was acceptable to the contesting parties. He presumed that Bishop Spalding as the " eminent sociologist " would provide the fifth man demanded by the operators, and as the " prominent ecclesiastic " would satisfy the miners; Mr. Clark could be added as the labor man, increasing the number to six. However, the operators insisted upon the President's adhering strictly to the letter of their prescription: there must be five, not six members on the board and these must answer exactly to the descriptions given. Mr. Roosevelt knew they wished Carroll D. Wright, United States Commissioner of Labor, for the eminent sociologist and he himself desired to include him in the group, which gave him three men, and, apparently, only one position to be filled, that of an eminent sociologist. He appointed Mr. Wright official recorder for the time and then concentrated on the problem of doing what he had determined to do and yet satisfy the operators.

---

[7] Nicholas Murray Butler to the writer, December 19, 1928.

[8] John Lancaster Spalding, *Socialism and Labor,* pp. 160-171.

Long drawn out discussion revealed that the great objection of the operators was to having a labor man as such added to the Commission. They did not in the least mind the President's appointing a labor man as the eminent sociologist and adding Bishop Spalding, but they could not consider his making Bishop Spalding or anyone else the eminent sociologist and adding a labor man. Thereupon, Mr. Roosevelt cheerfully called Mr. Clark a sociologist, and added Bishop Spalding as his personal choice. This explains why, in the official announcement of the personnel of the Commission, the President qualified the last two appointments thus:

> Mr. E. E. Clark . . . as a sociologist, the President assuming that for the purposes of such a commission the term sociologist means a man who has thought and studied deeply on social questions and has practically applied his knowledge.
>
> Bishop Spalding . . . The President has added Bishop Spalding's name to the Commission.[9]

This agreement was finally arrived at early in the morning of October 16 and brought general satisfaction. At one o'clock a. m., Secretary Root came from the room where he, the President, Secretary Cortelyou, Commissioners Sargent and Wright, and Messrs. Perkins and Bacon, the last two representing the Morgan interests, had been closeted for several hours, and announced happily that a settlement had been reached. At two-twenty Secretary Cortelyou, also with evident pleasure, made the official announcement of the appointment to the weary reporters, and immediately afterwards all the others came forth smiling. The news was sent broadcast and practically every paper in the land made it the subject of comment.

A careful perusal of a large number of newspaper and magazine clippings, representative of public opinion throughout the country, and personal research through the files of other papers, supplemented by conversation with some of the members of the Commission, have failed to discover evidence that anyone at any time raised the least objection to Bishop Spalding's membership on the Board.[10]

---

[9] *Evening Bulletin* (Philadelphia), October 16, 1902.

> There was never any opposition to the appointment. Because of his being a Catholic prelate you would have expected some, but there was never a breath of it. Everyone seemed to realize the sort of man he was, as Roosevelt realized it. He was the most liberal-minded person one could imagine—absolutely uninfluenced by a man's religion and wholly unpartisan in everything. He was entirely impervious to outside influence. He had his honest, sincere opinions and expressed them simply, honestly. Roosevelt knew he would, and he knew also that he would give his whole mind to the work, as he did.[11]

One paper issued the general statement that Morgan's partners objected to Mr. Clark and Dr. Spalding, but that the President insisted and they weakened. All evidence points to the conclusion that while they did object to an additional member, as is shown above, their objection was not directed against Bishop Spalding personally or as a Catholic ecclesiastic. President Baer, in answer to the question, " Is it true that the appointment of Bishop Spalding as a sixth member of the Commission does not meet the approval of the operators? " said:

> I see no reason why I should not answer that. President Roosevelt called me up by telephone and said he wished to appoint Bishop Spalding and asked me whether or not I would consent. Without consulting any of the other gentlemen, I gave my consent to the appointment. Next day, when I saw the other gentlemen, I told them what I had done, and they cheerfully ratified my action.[12]

It was generally agreed that the choice had been wisely made. The following from the *Baltimore Sun* is indicative of the nature of comments that came from all quarters:

> When an ecclesiastic was named as a member of what will probably prove the most momentous commission ever appointed by a President

---

[10] Clippings collected by Mr. J. M. Robb of Peoria, nephew-in-law of Bishop Spalding; lent by him to Father Culemans of Moline, Illinois, and in turn, by him, to the writer.

[11] Interview with E. W. Parker, May, 1929.

[12] *Catholic Standard and Times* (Philadelphia), October 25, 1902. (Quoting from *The New York Tribune*.)

> of the United States the attention of the people was not so much attracted to the fact that Mr. Roosevelt had ignored the restrictions with which the coal operators had sought to bind him as to the personality of the man selected and whose selection was emphasized as the personal choice of the President.[13]

The *Western Watchman* of St. Louis saw in it

> . . . a deserved recognition of that sterling prelate's rugged honesty in work and word and the singularly happy way he has of approaching difficult subjects of political economy.[14]

Although he was known to be deeply sympathetic with labor, the *Chicago Chronicle* asserted that the operators did not need to fear injustice at his hands:

> He will examine coldly, weigh deliberately, and decide judicially . . . His judgment will carry the greatest weight with his colleagues . . . because of his isolation from and indifference to partisan politics and because he has no personal interest in the result except the interest a humane American feels in the welfare of his fellow countrymen.[15]

Finally, Maurice Francis Egan summed up the story of the appointment thus:

> The President needed strong, sympathetic, trusted, intellectual men. He thought of Bishop Spalding as one of these and Bishop Spalding answered to the call of duty. The public acclaimed the choice.[16]

The Commission could hardly have been stronger in character or ability and was acceptable to both miners and operators. All the members were known to be " men who had done things and who could be depended upon to have ideas of their own and the courage of their convictions," [17] and people generally seemed to realize that " strength, steadiness, integrity, justice, and humanity were well represented and that righteousness must result from its deliberations." [78]

---

[13] *Baltimore Sun*, November 3, 1902.

[14] *Western Watchman* (St. Louis), October 25, 1902.

[15] *Chicago Chronicle*, October 19, 1902.

[16] *Louisville Record*, May, 1913 (Spalding Institute Scrap-book).

[17] *The Times* (Bath, Maine), October 29, 1902.

[18] *The Truth* (Scranton, Pennsylvania), October 16, 1902.

On October 16 word was sent to the men appointed and on the 24th they met with the President.[19] At his suggestion, they voted to make Mr. Wright a member and then he himself named Mr. Moseley and Dr. Neill to the position of recorders. The Commission received instructions and made plans for its future work and then adjourned to allow time for the statement of claims by the miners and the answers of the operators to be filed with it before its meeting in Scranton on November 14.[20]

This was to be no ordinary commission appointed merely to settle even a grave difficulty. Its purpose was intended to be far-reaching and is best stated by the man who called it into being. In his letter of formal appointment, President Roosevelt wrote:

> *To the Anthracite Coal Strike Commission*:
>
> *Gentlemen*: At the request both of the operators and of the miners, I have appointed you a Commission to inquire into, consider, and pass upon the questions in controversy in connection with the strike in the anthracite region, and the causes out of which the controversy arose. By the action you recommend, which the parties in interest have in advance consented to abide by, you will endeavor to establish the relations between the employers and the wage workers in the anthracite fields on a just and permanent basis, and, as far as possible, to do away with any causes for the recurrence of such difficulties as those which you have been called in to settle. I submit to you herewith the published statement of the operators, following which I named you as members of the Commission.[21]
>
> THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

This placed a heavy responsibility in their hands, so heavy that President Olyphant of the Delaware and Hudson Railroad said that even the question of wages the men were to receive and of how they were to be paid in the different mines and in different veins in the same mines were problems that men had grown gray-headed trying to solve;[22] and Mr. E. B. Thomas, Chairman of the Executive Board of the Erie Road, said he considered the adjustment of difficulties would be a long drawn out and difficult undertaking.[23] Subsequent events proved that both were right and their prediction gives us some idea of the magnitude of the task that was so well executed by the Commission.

---

[19] *Roosevelt Papers,* Library of Congress (Letter from G. B. Cortelyou to Bishop Spalding, October 21, 1902).

[20] *Report,* p. 14.

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] *The Herald* (Baltimore), October 17, 1902.

The Sunday following the meeting with the President, Bishop Spalding preached at St. Patrick's Church in Washington. The church was crowded with distinguished people, among them Secretary Root, " who was given a good seat near the pulpit and paid undivided attention to the sermon." Many diplomats and minor officials of the government were also present. Those who attended the services seem to have expected that the Bishop would make reference in his sermon to the coal controversy and the projected plan of settlement, but " he did not allude even remotely to the questions which he is to aid in arbitrating ", wrote the reporter for the *Boston Herald.* " He preached an eloquent sermon on the gospel of the day." [24]

At dinner afterwards Dr. Stafford was host to Bishop Spalding and other distinguished guests, among whom were Bishop Conaty, Rector of the Catholic University of America, Dr. Pace and Dr. Hyvernat, two internationally recognized scholars and pioneer professors at the Catholic University, and Maurice Francis Egan, man of letters and, at that time, professor of English at the University.[25] On subsequent occasions, during the course of the sessions of the Commission in and near Washington, when Bishop Spalding was Dr. Stafford's guest, Dr. Pace and Dr. Egan were frequently asked to dinner. According to Dr. Pace, the Bishop and Dr. Egan, who were warm friends, agreed on many cultural topics but disagreed heartily and outspokenly on others, and the comparatively youthful professor of philosophy and psychology and the host found the arguments of the other two stimulating and thoroughly enjoyable. Dr. Pace said that he and Dr. Stafford furnished a keenly appreciative audience to conversation that was worthy of

[23] *Ibid.*

[24] *The Herald* (Boston), October 27, 1902.

[25] *Washington Post*, October 27, 1902.

being broadcast to the whole world and recorded for all time. One of his happiest memories in later years was of those evenings spent in the rectory of St. Patrick's.[26]

While preparations were being made for the hearings in the coal regions, the members of the Commission, at the suggestion of Mr. Watkins, spent some days inspecting actual conditions in the mines and in the homes of the miners. It seems that the Bishop at first was not particularly enthusiastic about going into the mines, but he consented to don the miner's cap and jacket and overalls and went with the others. He became deeply interested in everything he observed during the tour of inspection—in the mines, homes, and schools. He impressed the other Commissioners then and during the sessions with his interest in and concern for the children.[27] Regarding this, the *New York Times* carried a story that is significant enough to bear quoting:

> *Harper's Weekly* is troubled because Judge Gray and Bishop Spalding, while visiting the coal breakers, distributed an unrecorded number of small coins among the boys working in those grimy edifices. This, our neighbor fears, was a betrayal of sympathy for the miners, and it is absolutely "astounded" that such gifts were made by a man occupying a seat on the bench of a United States court and deputed, by virtue of his position, to preside over the Anthracite Coal Commission. "What would Judge Gray say", it asks, "of an occupant of a judicial tribunal who, while a litigation was pending before him, should publicly make a gift of money to the children of one of the litigants? Would he deem such conduct worthy of a Judge, or calculated to convince the bar that the judgment to be rendered in the case then pending would be entirely "unbiased"? That hath a most serious sound, but somehow it moves to smiles rather than to tears, and we can still hope that public confidence will not be withdrawn either from the Judge or the Bishop. In the things that really counted, the commissioners have shown themselves commendably careful to preserve the shadow as well as the substance of perfect impartiality. They have refused to traverse the coal region in trains supplied by the operators, and in many other ways they have manifested full appreciation of the delicacy of their great task. That two or all of them gave pennies to the breaker boys proved sympathy indeed,

---

[26] Interview with the Rev. Dr. Edward A. Pace, April, 1929.

[27] Interviews with Messrs Watkins and Parker, May, 1929.

> but only sympathy for unfortunate little fellows. No harm was done.[28]

Investigation showed that these boys were receiving *forty cents for a day of ten hours* of back-breaking toil. Another newspaper comment on the same incident, reads thus:

> It is feared that the *Weekly* itself either has not much sympathy for dirty poor boys or no confidence in the integrity of high Judges and Bishops.[29]

Bishop Spalding was not familiar with mining conditions, as some had supposed, but he quickly learned all about them.[30] However, as we should expect, and as is shown in the *Report,* he was chiefly interested not so much in details as in the larger underlying questions, in the *causes* of the conditions with which he and his associates were confronted.[31]

On November 14 the regular sessions began. These were public and always well attended. A Philadelphia reporter has given us the following graphic picture of them:

> The Arbitration Commission's sessions are full of repressed drama, yet free from any theatrical effect.
>
> Where in seven men's hands lies the future of some hundreds of thousands . . . one might look for great emotion, tense expectancy, tremendous human interest. This is found, but not as expected . . . Repression, subduedness, reserved feeling is the dominant note.
>
> There at the long walnut bench sit the seven arbiters—a certain definite something, more than dignity, less than hauteur, that marks men as leaders stamped upon the face of each.
>
> Gray, the Judge, sits in the center. A massive man, grizzled and picturesquely, handsome, the soft light of sympathy and the hard glitter of sternness coming and going in his eyes, he follows closely every word of the testimony. Sometimes, in a big rumbling voice, he asks questions or comments upon answers or laughs. Here is a man, one feels, whose declaration will be Justice itself, but it will be tempered with kindliness, with feeling for those it affects.

---

[28] *New York Times,* November 16, 1902.

[29] *News and Courier* (Charleston, S. C.), November 18, 1902.

[30] Interview with Messrs Watkins and Parker.

[31] Interview with E. E. Clark, April, 1929.

> There is Spalding, the Bishop; Parker, the scholar; Clark, the Labor Unionist; all three with calm, inscrutable faces; all smooth-shaven and regular featured—stoics, deep thinkers, men whom emotion does not sway.
>
> There is a touch of ruggedness and absolute impartiality about Wright, the Commissioner of Labor—and Wilson, the veteran general, tall and spare-built with white hair and goatee, red cheeks and quick, nervous manner.
>
> Watkins is the kind one might expect to see leading a cotillion—dark-haired, black-moustached, handsome, and always faultlessly dressed.
>
> The non-union men sit at the other end of the room from the Commission—about two hundred of them—grimly severe of face, open-eyed, open-mouthed, forward-bent, to hear every word. But they never seem stirred by it, never moved to excitement. Evidently to them it is only an occasion of awesome solemnity.
>
> Between the two ranks are the combatants—lawyers for the non-union men, looked upon as allies of the operators, and attorneys for the union, with Mitchell. This grave quiet young man maintains a perpetual vigilance. He questions nearly all. Darrow the Chicagoan, whose face, wrinkled, close-shaven and strikingly unlovely, is the face of a stage tragedian. His hair, long and thick, hangs over his eyes.
>
> The union miners are by far the most dramatic. Tales that in the mouths of others would be veritable epics are told with as much emotion as a polite stranger would display in asking where the City Hall is.
>
> Thus the battle moves on—its warriors active, aggressive, determined; its spectators open-eyed, open-mouthed, bent forward; its judges cool, calm, impartial; itself a great far-reaching event.[32]

Bishop Spalding thoroughly enjoyed anything of a humorous nature that came up during the public sessions, and questioned witnesses at least as much as anyone did.[33] This was observed by more than one reporter:

> All visitors were anxious to see Bishop Spalding. His habit of sitting with closed eyes led many to believe he slept through the dull parts of the testimony, but this idea was dispelled by the Bishop's suddenly opening his eyes and questioning the witness.[34]

---

[32] *The Press* (Philadelphia), January 8, 1903.

[33] Interview with Thomas H. Watkins.

[34] *The Press* (Philadelphia), February 16, 1903.

> Bishop Spalding is asking as many questions in the hard coal district as old Li Hung Chang did on a previous occasion.[35]

> Bishop Spalding is manifesting great interest in his work as a member of the coal strike commission. He asks more questions than any of the other members, indicating a keen desire to get at the bottom of the controversy in which all Americans are so much interested.[36]

> "Every report coming from the anthracite region," says the *New World*, "has it that Bishop Spalding is one of the keenest questioners on conditions of any of the famous coal strike commission. The other members wonder where he learned the art of cross-examination."[37]

> Associated Press despatches refer to Bishop Spalding's thoroughness in the coal strike investigation. "If anyone shows a deeper interest it is Bishop Spalding." "He asks more questions than any other member." This is the Bishop's record . . . He is thorough in his own private affairs; in the affairs of the great Church in which he occupies so distinguished a part; in public affairs he is no mean factor; in his patriotism and love of country . . . Thoroughness is one of his chief graces.[38]

It was intended that the Commission hear the dispute and pass on it, but it soon became apparent that that would be a waste of time. Ten thousand pages of report were taken, and while, from the viewpoint of human interest, they were invaluable, for the purposes of the Commission they were practically worthless.[39] The members realized this soon after the beginning of the hearings and delegated Dr. Neill to collect detailed information on certain points and submit it to them. Then they listened to witness after witness, the report was taken, but generally they used Dr. Neill's findings. For example, the question of the method of paying the miners came up. Sometimes they were paid by the car, but the miners contended that the car became larger and the pay did not increase. Sometimes they were paid by the ton, and they said that the number of pounds to the ton was increased while their pay remained the same. Sometimes the vein, instead of being horizontal, was tilted. Then the miner was paid by the yard. They contended that in this case the measurement was inaccurate. They demanded that they be paid by the *weight* of the coal mined, but the operators objected that it could be weighed only by installing a weighing machine at the place where the coal leaves the shaft and before it goes into the breaker, and that that would slow down the work. The operators demanded that the right to weigh the coal and to dock miners for impurities, stones, etc., in the coal be left to them exclusively. The miners asked that they be allowed at least the privilege of checking the weighing and docking processes. Dr. Neill spent two weeks on this one problem: Was there need for the kind of protection that check-weighing and check-docking bosses give, and is it essential that the miners be paid by the weight of the coal mined? The companies objected that miners put rock in the cars to increase the weight and were told they could dock them for such practices. Some were already doing that and the miners claimed that it was being done unfairly. Therefore, the Commission provided that the miners be free to employ check weighers and check dockers.[40]

---

[35] *The Age-Herald* (Birmingham, Alabama), November 6, 1902.

[36] *The Evening Times* (Buffalo, New York), November 8, 1902.

[37] *Sacred Heart Review* (Boston), November 15, 1902.

[38] *Herald-Transcript* (Peoria, Illinois), November 1, 1902.

[39] Interview with Charles P. Neill, April, 1929.

Frequently the Commissioners met privately for discussion, and there was always the greatest respect shown for each other and for each man's opinion. All the meetings were untroubled, " but ", said Mr. Parker, " if there had been any sort of dissension, it's the Bishop who would have poured oil on the troubled waters. Each man ", he continued, " was supposed to be best informed on some phase of the Commission's work, but all deferred especially to Bishop Spalding, no matter what was being discussed." Mr. Parker and the others declared that the Bishop had much to do with the guiding of the work. He was impressed, above all, with the complexity of the situation. He did not take merely an academic view of it, but followed everything carefully with sane practical judgment and an intelligent grasp of the situation. Yet all the while he was animated by a fine spirit of idealism. He made a profound impression on all the members of the Commission, who found in him a helpful and entirely lovable companion.[41] Their respect for him was deep and sincere. Long afterwards President Roosevelt voiced the sentiments of all the Commissioners when, in expressing to Abbé Klein his appreciation of Bishop Spalding's contribution to the work, he declared:

---

[40] Interview with Charles P. Neill, April, 1929.

> . . . He rendered great service. His advice, always wise and always listened to by the other members, contributed a great deal toward the happy solution of that struggle.[42]

The Bishop did not spend much time with the others between the sessions, though sometimes he had dinner with them, on which occasions he said grace for them.[43] In Scranton he stayed with Bishop Hoban, in Philadelphia with Archbishop Ryan, and in Washington with Dr. Stafford of St. Patrick's, and he was called upon in all these cities for preaching and lecturing. If we may credit the Boston *Republic,* he preached every Sunday after the investigation began, occupying some pulpit in whatever city the Commission happened to be working.[44] There is record of at least some of these sermons, and of lectures delivered in the large cities.

On November 1, he preached at High Mass in St. Peter's Cathedral in Scranton. A formal invitation was sent to the members of the Commission to attend the service and they went in a body.[45] The account of the incident, as it appeared in the *New York Sun* informs us that

> . . . There was a great crush at St. Peter's Cathedral where Bishop Spalding was announced to speak. It was the first opportunity that many in the city had of seeing the members of the Commission and they turned out by the hundreds, men of all denominations, many from the cities and towns up and down the valley. It was another indication of the intense interest that the people are taking in the doings of the Commission. The Commissioners occupied front seats

[41] Interviews with Messrs Clark, Parker, Neill, Watkins.

[42] Felix Klein, *In the Land of the Strenuous Life,* p. 244.

[43] Interview with Thomas H. Watkins.

[44] *The Republic* (Boston), November 22, 1902.

[45] Interview with E. W. Parker.

> and were evidently much pleased with the eloquence, force, and theme of the Bishop. There was a great gathering of priests in the sanctuary, including Bishop Hoban of the Scranton diocese . . . The text of the sermon was the tenth verse of the thirteenth chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans: Love worketh no ill to the neighbor; love is the fulfilling of the law. The application of the sermon to the task before the Strike Commission was so plain that everyone understood.[46]

On November 16, he was introduced by Bishop Hoban to a large audience in the Lyceum Theatre of Scranton and delivered an " eloquent address " on success. The program was for the benefit of the House of the Good Shephard. " Fellow members of the Commission attended the lecture in a body and President Mitchell of the Mine Workers, with some friends, was also present." [47]

On January 11, he preached on the Epiphany in the Cathedral of Philadelphia to a " congregation that it would have required twice the capacity of the edifice, immense as it is, to seat. There was no reference to the Anthracite Strike Commission or its business in the sermon." [48]

On January 20, in Philadelphia, he lectured before the American Catholic Historical Society on the history of Catholic education in the United States.[49]

Returning to Washington, he accepted an invitation to deliver a lecture on January 25th, under the auspices of the Washington Council, Knights of Columbus, on " The Worth and Meaning of Education." Public opinion there was expressed through the columns of the Washington *Post,* in its announcement of the forthcoming event:

> The Knights of Columbus are doing the public a real service in presenting the eloquent and scholarly lecturer to a Washington audience. Since his appointment by President Roosevelt as a member of the Arbitration Commission, the Bishop has added to his already great reputation as a broad-minded and many-sided man. In a world of

[46] *The New York Sun,* November 3, 1902.

[47] *The Truth* (Scranton), November 17, 1902.

[48] *The Inquirer* (Philadelphia), January 12, 1903.

[49] *The Public Ledger and the Philadelphia Times,* January 21, 1903.

> lecturers he has been long a commanding figure, and his poetry, his philosophy, and his essays have thousands of readers and admirers outside the circle of his own Church. It is safe to predict that the largest hall in Washington will not accommodate all who wish to hear the distinguished lecturer.[50]

In the audience were to be found "many who had acquired prominence in educational circles, as well as those who desired to hear such an important subject discussed by one so familiar with the great question."[51]

In New York, three weeks later, with Archbishop Farley presiding, he lectured in Carnegie Hall for the benefit of the St. Vincent De Paul Society;[52] and on March 18, at the Catholic University of America, in the presence of the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Falconio, the Mexican Ambassador, the Presidents of Georgetown University, Gonzaga College, and St. John's College, the Hon. John Lee Carroll, ex-Governor of Maryland, Judge Barry of Winnepeg, Manitoba, the Hon. Hannis Taylor, former Minister to Spain, and other distinguished guests. The audience of over a thousand people represented all classes of the nation's capital. The *Western Watchman* of St. Louis, in commenting on the Washington address, stated that the audience that thronged McMahon Hall to hear the Bishop speak was the largest ever assembled there. "The large hall was crowded to overflowing, as were also the corridors leading to the entrance, a tribute to one who is recognized as the foremost leader in the religious and educational life of the country."[53] The *New Century* of Washington considered that this lecture was

> . . . a refutation of those who claim that the spoken address as a literary form is no longer to be taken seriously. The Bishop of Peoria knows how to denude the oration of those qualities that make it ineffective from the literary point of view and to give it a subtlety of expression and a clarity of form that is entirely a lie to the older tradition. Bishop Spalding's occasional lectures and sermons in this city

---

[50] *The Post* (Washington, D. C.), January 15, 1903.

[51] *The Times* (Washington, D. C.), January 26, 1903.

[52] *Catholic News* (New York), February 16, 1903.

[53] *The Western Watchman* (St. Louis), March 26, 1903.

> during the past few months are one of the few luxuries that we owe the coal strike.[54]

It seems, however, that our Bishop was not doing all the noteworthy preaching during this time. Reverend Merle Wright of the Unitarian Church on Lenox Avenue, New York, preached two sermons on Bishop Spalding. In the second of the series, entitled, " Bishop Spalding, the Catholic ", he went so far as to say to his congregation, " If all Catholics are as catholic as Bishop Spalding, then it is Catholic I wish to make you! " [55]

After the anthracite case had been submitted by the parties and argument had been exhausted, the Commissioners worked for weeks on the *Report* in a room of the Interstate Commerce Commission building in Washington.[56] First they went into conference on the general situation and developed the controlling impressions of the various Commissioners and decided upon the features for the *Report.* The whole subject was divided into topics, each man being assigned one upon which he was to prepare the first draft of a chapter for the *Report.* In a second conference these chapters were read, discussed, criticized, and subjected to some changes in the light of the general view. Then they were placed in the hands of Carroll D. Wright to be merged into a single report. This was carefully examined by the entire Commission and finally edited.[57] The specific portion assigned to Bishop Spalding in the preparation of the *Report,* " The Work of the Commission," shows the grasp he had of industrial problems.[58]

The *Report* was unanimous. It was decided early that when it came time to hand down a decision, the vote of the majority should be the vote of the Commission. That is why it is difficult to trace the influence of any one member. But, apart from his own chapter and the many suggestions as to the use of words, phrases, and general literary structure that were made by Bishop Spalding, there is much in the *Report* that all four of his associates who were interviewed regarding it remember was definitely contributed by him. He had a particularly large share in the making up of that part of it that has to do with human relations—the social phase of the work. His influence was felt also in the efforts made to provide against strikes in the future through a program of conciliation,[59] and Mr. Kennedy, Secretary-Treasurer of the United Mine Workers of America says that, in that respect, the *Report* of the Commission is the foundation upon which the Union has been building for many years. In his judgment, the fact that the two sides got together under the terms of the awards of 1903 and have been meeting ever since, constituted the real force and effectiveness of the *Report*.[60] What was arranged for by the Commission was a board of conciliation, composed of one representative of the miners from each of the three districts and one representative of the operators from each. If these six were not able to come to an agreement, recourse was to be had to an umpire, appointed by the circuit judge. The umpire's decision was to be final.[61]

---

[54] *The New Century* (Washington, D. C.), March 21, 1903.

[55] *New York Tribune,* December 15, 1902.

[56] Interview with E. W. Parker.

[57] Interview with E. E. Clark.

[58] Interview with Thos. H. Watkins.

The finished *Report* did not provide for the granting of all the miners' demands, but it considered them all and met them fairly, and advanced so far towards establishing a lasting basis for peace between Capital and Labor that President Roosevelt stated frankly that if there were nothing else to his credit, he would be content to go out of office upon that record alone.[62]

The three-year agreement provided for in the *Report* was renewed for two additional terms of three years each, and even today, every time there is a consultation on matters relating to the industry the *Report* is brought out and parts of it are referred to.[63]

The vastly improved condition of the people and the unprecedented peace and prosperity that mark the mining operations in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania attest the far-reaching beneficent effect of the work of the Commission. Each member of it is deserving of the highest commendation for his ability, disinterestedness, competence to deal with the grave problems involved, and earnest endeavor to achieve success in the task entrusted to him; but to the influence of Bishop Spalding, according to the testimony of at least four of those who labored with him, must be attributed, in no small measure, the immediate success of the work and the idealistic character of it that has given it permanent value.

---

[59] Interview with Charles P. Neill.

[60] Letter from Thomas Kennedy to the writer, December, 1941.

[61] Interview with Charles P. Neill.

[62] Interview with Charles P. Neill.

[63] Interview with E. W. Parker, and letter from Thomas Kennedy.

The schools in the region are exceptionally good and even larger than needed, and the law forbids children under eighteen years of age to work in the mines. These improvements and those in general living and working conditions date from the Strike Commission of 1902-1903.[64]

The region is entirely unionized under the Anthracite Agreement which expires April 30, 1943, but there has been no general strike before or since 1925. Since 1903, the Wyoming Barracks of the State Police have been kept in the anthracite regions, replacing the " Coal and Iron Police " of the companies that had previously been a source of hard feeling among the miners; but for many years there has been less and less reason for the maintenance of any such police force in the region.[65]

The friendship between President Roosevelt and Bishop Spalding dated from the appointment of the Commission. Abbé Klein asserted that he had rarely heard one man praise another with such warmth as animated President Roosevelt when speaking of Bishop Spalding.[66] He visited him in Peoria on three different occasions after the Bishop fell ill, and, in many ways, showed in what esteem and affection he held him.

Bishop Spalding's physician maintained that his work on the Commission did much to bring on the stroke that afflicted him in January, 1905—that the confining, responsible, trying work [67] and the being deprived of the opportunity for the regular exercise to which he was accustomed placed too great a strain on one of his years. But if the Bishop himself believed that, he certainly never regretted it. On the contrary, in a letter to the President, in 1907, thanking him for the gift of a set of his books, he wrote:

---

[64] Interview with Thomas H. Watkins.

[65] Letter from Thomas Kennedy.

[66] Felix Klein, *In the Land of the Strenuous Life*, p. 150.

[67] To give attention six days a week for sixteen consecutive weeks to testimony that averaged 100 pages a day when recorded, and preach and lecture

> As you know, for two years now I have been an invalid. I regret this the more because I imagine had I been well and strong you might have found some useful thing for me to do.[68]

The others of the Commission always said that it was the greatest event in their lives, and we may be sure that Bishop Spalding was thankful that he had been able to contribute so largely to the accomplishment of that "useful thing."

SISTER MARY EVANGELA

Clarke College

---

on Sundays was enough to tax the endurance of a much younger man. To prepare and edit the *Report* within another period of four weeks was also a gigantic task.

[68] Theodore Roosevelt, *Private Correspondence* (Library of Congress).

CHURCH AND STATE IN THE FIRST DECADE OF MEXICAN INDEPENDENCE *

THE first half of the nineteenth century found Mexico going through a cycle of Church-State relations that was common to all the countries of Hispanic America.[1] From colonial times came the inheritance of a rigidly controlled, all-embracing system called the royal patronage or *patronato real.* The second phase, in the movement toward independence, saw the organization of the Church so disrupted that a satisfactory arrangement with government was impossible. Bishops were not appointed to fill sees vacated by death or exile. Priests died in great numbers in the wars. The Spanish clergy in the main was forced to return to the mother country. The closing of seminaries on account of these conditions dried up the sources of a new clergy for a time. The absence of episcopal control allowed many of the clerics to turn their efforts into politics or other fields in ways rather foreign to their calling. Finally, the break in contact with the papacy through the severance of relations with Madrid, and the failure of the popes to recognize the independence of the new nations until after the death of Ferdinand VII, played a large part in delaying a permanent arrangement.[2]

The third phase of the cycle found the Church reconstructing its episcopal organization. This was the critical period, when the government attempted to reach a stable agreement with the Church, while the latter, without its natural leaders in the hierarchy, relied for support on priests and laymen.[3] Despite the efforts of these spokesmen, they utterly lacked the authority and the personal power ordinarily exercised by the bishops. In time bishops were appointed, only to find, in the fourth phase, a time of stress and trial under the domination of those who called themselves liberals, anticlericals, or Jacobins.[4] In Mexico that phase is still running.

---

* Paper read at the Twenty-Second Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, Chicago, December 31, 1941.

[1] *The Catholic Historical Review,* from January 1940 to January 1941, carried a series of articles dealing with this subject in the principal countries.

[2] Hubert Howe Bancroft, *History of Mexico,* Vols. IV and V (San Francisco. 1886, 1887), deals in considerable detail with these points, though in widely scattered chapters. His virulent generalities in Chapter xxiv of his sixth volume, especially the footnote to page 583, scarcely represent his usually factual style. They are copied by others, particularly by N. A. N. Cleven in his "Ecclesiastical Policy of Maximilian of Mexico", *Hispanic American Historical Review,* IX (1929), 321 ff. (This periodical is hereafter cited as *H. A. H. R.*).

In all four phases the axis of strife is the *patronato real.* Its excesses helped much to bring on the revolutions. Its cessation during the conflict produced ecclesiastical chaos. It was closely tied up with the efforts toward reconstructing the hierarchy. Finally, most of the subsequent governmental attack on the Church has derived from the inherited idea of state control over religion. The tradition of the *patronato* still reigns in Mexican officialdom.[5]

The first decade of independence found the presidential regime continuing the actions of the viceroy, though under the guise of constitutional approval. Ministries could not understand how affairs could carry on without the *patronato* power, so thoroughly had three centuries of its use embedded this absolutist practice in official thinking. The debate turned chiefly on whether it was a right inherent in national sovereignty or a power granted by privilege from ecclesiastical origin.

To the average layman, however, this crown attribute furnished abundant reason for the independence movement, whether in its employment by the old regalist crowd of Charles III and his Aranda, Campomanes, Roda, and Floridablanca, or by the Spanish rulers under the 1812 Cadiz Constitution and its 1820 sequel. This power had suppressed the educational and benevolent Orders. In 1804 it had amortized the funds of the *Obras Pias* and thus caused serious economic dislocation. Moreover it was an instrument for continuing the appointment of Spaniards to American prelacies. And the American clergy, no less than the Papal Curia, were convinced from bitter experience that the old system had to go.

---

[3] Good material for this phase of the question may be found in Lucas Alamán, *Historia de México* (Mexico, 1849-1850), especially in Volume V, and in José María de Bocanegra, *Memorias para la historia de México independiente, 1822-1846* (Mexico, 1892).

[4] A serious study of this matter is Regis Planchet, *La Cuestión Religiosa en México* (El Paso, 1927), one of the few works that deals critically with Juárez.

[5] No student of this subject should omit a reading of the vituperation issued by Emilio Portes Gil, *The Conflict Between the Civil Power and the Clergy,* produced significantly in English by the Press of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Mexico, 1935).

The whole system was so vital a factor in the story that it demands some special explanation. Under the *patronato real,* all funds for the support of religion became by a fiction of law government moneys, to be dispensed by the administration in Madrid or by its subordinate viceroys, who gave approval and direction to every major religious activity. All religious corporations looked directly to the court for authorizations, permissions, subventions, or judgment of pleas. The crown held the nomination of bishops, canons, parish priests, the erection of convents, colleges, welfare associations, and the conceding of the *pase regio* to all indulgences, privileges, and pontifical bulls.[6] The official backing given this system by the papacy from the first days of the Conquest made its prerogative unquestioned.

Until the middle of the eighteenth century the crown considered this right a privilege in law. After that period the regalists argued that it was an essential attribute of sovereignty, and, as has been said, they used it in a regalistic fashion. In fact one can find here something pretty close to the contemporary Totalitarian State. It certainly went into Latin American government tradition as an entirely undemocratic practice.

The all-pervading influence of the *patronato* can be seen in the words of Mr. Pattee:

> The Patronato governed every relationship between the Church and the State. Although doctrinally uniform, the Patronato led the Church, especially the hierarchy, to gravitate more toward Madrid than toward Rome, depending more on the Council of the Indies than on the Vatican. So great was the obstruction of normal communication between Rome and the various dioceses of the Spanish-speaking world that Monsignor Guistiniani, nuncio in Madrid in 1825, com-

---

[6] To gain a thorough knowledge of the *patronato* one must examine the *Recopilación de Leyes de los reinos de las Indias* (Madrid, 1681 and 1841), and Juan Pereira Solórzano, *Disputatio de Indiarum Jure* (Madrid, 1629).

> plained to the papal secretary of state that "The Laws of the Indies are so iniquitous as not to permit the bishops to forward to Rome the reports of their dioceses without the authorization of the supreme Council of the Indies. The obstacles which have been placed in the way of ecclesiastical authorities in America are such as to bring about confusion in canon law and introduce into Spain a sort of Anglican supremacy.[7]

And it is worthy of note that this same Cardinal Guistiniani, by the veto of the Spanish crown, was excluded from the papal election of 1831, precisely because of his attitude toward the *patronato* and American affairs.[8]

Now the whole tendency of the independence movement made for a stoppage of the *patronato,* and this in turn cut off the Mexican Church from Rome. *Patronato* and crown were identified, and hostility toward the latter included a determination to stop its ecclesiastical power. The fighting under Hidalgo and Morelos resulted in the execution of two hundred priests, judged guilty of aiding rebellion.[9] During the wars the bishops, whose power derived directly from Madrid and only indirectly from Rome, suffered a loss of esteem and severe condemnation in many quarters. The Inquisition, an institution bound up closely in theory and practice with the *patronato,* lost enormously in popular respect, for it held to the side of Spain. In so doing it used the sanctions of an illegal body, having been estopped at the source in Spain by the voluntary abdication of its power at the instance of Napoleon in 1808; whence the acts of its Mexican subsidiary were null and void. It was a purely political instrument of arbitrary men.[10]

The stoppage of the *patronato* rule was most felt in the failure to provide new bishops for vacant sees. Spain refused to nominate

---

[7] Richard F. Pattee, "The Role of Catholic Culture in Ecuador", *The Catholic Historical Review,* XXV (1940), 437.

[8] See J. M. March, "La exclusiva dada por España contra el Cardinal Guistiniani en el conclave de 1830-1831, según los Despachos diplomáticos", Razón y Fe, XCVIII, 420 (1932, January), 55 ff.

[9] Mariano Cuevas, *Historia de la Iglesia en México* (El Paso, 1928), V, 175. Cited hereafter as Cuevas, *H. I. M.*)

[10] *Ibid.,* V, 62-68.

Americans for these positions, and the Spanish crown successfully blocked direct Roman nominations. The need for bishops was great. At the coronation of Iturbide in 1822, only four were left, out of a normal complement of ten, and of these the chief, Archbishop Pedro José de Fonte of Mexico, at once went off to Havana on a plea of ill health, and from there to Spain for the duration of his life. By 1827 only one remained, Joaquín Antonio Pérez of Puebla, and his death in 1829 left the nation without any ordinary whatever, a situation which in a Catholic country is most serious because of the monarchical nature of episcopal powers.

In order to reconstitute the hierarchy it was necessary either that Rome take a step that was without precedent for three centuries in Hispanic America—to name proprietary bishops, or at least vicars apostolic—, or else that the government obtain or assume the right to name its own bishops. To name proprietary bishops would affront the crown of Spain, a move that in those days entailed great danger to the Church, as can be seen in the Spanish threats made in connection with the veto of the candidacy of Guistiniani. He himself had written from Madrid to Rome in 1827 that "The decision of the Holy See relative to the American bishops has produced a profound reaction [here] . . . They hope to obtain [separation] from Rome."[11] On the other hand, to name vicars apostolic would wound the national pride of the new republic. Finally, that the government assume the right to name its own bishops would be tantamount to schism. The only possible course was to induce Rome to grant a modified *patronato* to Mexico, or else to override any protest of Spain and to appoint proprietary bishops.

This last was the move finally made. Its achievement constituted the great problem, both in Mexico and in Rome. The papacy was unable to recognize any of the Latin American countries until after the death of Ferdinand VII in 1833. Colombia was first recognized in 1835.[12] The story in Mexico involves the domestic congressional problem and a complex ecclesiastical situation in the young republic. Throughout the narrative the student is constantly conscious of another simple but easily overlooked aspect of the question, the entire unpreparedness of the Mexican statesmen to handle the new democratic State.

---

[11] This situation is adequately treated in the article cited above (note 8) from *Razón y Fe*.

[12] J. Lloyd Mecham, "The Papacy and Spanish-American Independence", *H. A. H. R.*, IX (1929), 155 ff.

The passing of the bishops opened the way for a small clerical minority to take a large part in shaping the eventual path of the Mexican government. Their behavior gives a partial reason for the reluctance of the papacy to name bishops to the vacant sees. Beyond this, there was a true scarcity of eligible clerics. The lack of strong bishops allowed for the growth of a free-lance type of clergy who moved about in the political and social fields with little or no check. Other factors dating from 1765 [13]—the quartering of a regular army in Mexico, and the spread of a modified infidelity, of regalistic ideas, and of the Scottish Rite after 1813—had their influence on the clergy. Under the old *patronato* system there was room for what we know as a "radical fringe"; it could easily be segregated or controlled. Now it had an open field, while on the other hand men of high caliber such as Vásquez, Lerdo, and Arrillaga became the object of public criticism in the controversies with the liberal forces, and they were not suggested as candidates of the government.[14]

It may be recalled that in the elections of 1822 the *ayuntamiento* of Mexico elected a preponderance of clergy to Congress,[15] in the hope that these men would block any acceptance of the Spanish constitutional ideas of 1812, reaffirmed in the 1820 Riego movement. Most of these men justified their choice by the electorate. Not so a man such as Servando Teresa de Mier, who declared in Congress on June 21, 1823: "Each diocese has from its Divine Founder all the powers necessary for defending and expanding itself, without any necessity to go to Rome." [16] His constant theme

---

[13] A fine summary of the causes leading to a decline in religion in Mexico is given in Cuevas, *op. cit.*, IV, *Parte Tercera.*

[14] On the work of these men see Gerard Decorme, *Historia de la Compañia de Jesús en la República Mexicana durante el siglo XIX* (Guadalajara, 1914),

[16] Cited in Cuevas, *op. cit.*, V, 164. Cf. also Decorme, *op. cit.*, I, 278.

[15] *Ibid.*, I, 215.

[16] Cited in Cuevas, *op. cit.*, V, 164. Cf. also Decorme, *op. cit.*, I, 278.

held that the *patronato* was an attribute of the nation, and could thus be assumed without any papal grant. Miguel Ramos Arizpe, the *clerigazo* or queer cleric, became a member of the Yorkist lodge and took a prominent part in the formation of their 1829 program of " reform " whose platform read:

> Convinced that the Mexican clergy is a permanent obstacle to the reforms, for it resists colonization and is odious to foreigners, the National Mexican Rite adopts in all its parts the following plan or program of reform, which program is to be brought forward in the Houses of Congress on the basis on which it was conceived:
>
> 1. Absolute liberty of opinion and suppression of laws repressive of the press.
> 2. Abolition of the privileges of the clergy and of the militia.
> 3. Suppression of the monastic orders and of all laws that attribute to the clergy the right to conduct civil matters such as the contract of matrimony.
> 4. Improvement of the moral status of the classes by the destruction of the monopoly which the clergy has on public education: diffuse the means of knowledge, inculcate social manners, form museums, conservatories of arts and public libraries, create establishments of learning, of classical literature, science, and ethics.[17]

We need not stop here to discuss in this program the profession of enlightenment which threw a camouflage over the basic anti-clericalism.

Allied to this group was the cleric José Alpulche, the shadow of Gómez Farias and the assistant of Zavala in founding the five Yorkist lodges in 1825.[18] Another was José María Luis Mora, who hung up his habit and put on that of a publicist and historian, his writings destined to become the sourcebook of Mexican baiters of religion.[19] These men became the chaplains of Freemasonry, and the fraternity, under the prestige of their membership, had remarkable success. It is the writer's contention that Masonry counted in the debates of these days far less for its political opinions than for its character as the channel through which particular individuals made their political opinions prevail. The lodges did get action, but they were used as tools by certain politicians with an axe to grind. One very strange episode in this tie-up between the clergy of the left and the lodges occurred in 1832. The new Bishop of Puebla was charged by Gregory XVI in a Bull of July 12, 1831, with improving the status of the regular Orders. Seventy religious joined the York lodges in the capital to block the move, and it was effectively stopped in as far as congressional action could impede it. It is said on good authority that the same group handed $16,000 to the president for the same purpose.[20]

---

[17] Quoted in Mariano Cuevas, *Historia de la Nación Mexicana* (Mexico, 1940), p. 539. On Arizpe see also Cuevas, *H. I. M.*, V, 160, and Alamán, *op. cit.*, V, 624 f.

[18] Cf. Decorme, *op. cit.*, I, 267.

[19] He is treated at length in Cuevas, *H. I. M.*, V, 161 and *passim*.

For the papacy to choose bishops from this type of clergy was a most delicate task, in view of the double drawback of their own deficiencies and their close connection with the lodges which were committed to the self-styled " liberal attitude " toward the Church. To such men the pope would grant no *patronato*.

Yet it should not be thought that the liberals had abandoned their religion. José María Fagoaga, one of the first laymen to join the Scottish Rite, declared in full session of Congress on April 17, 1823, for " an envoy to Rome, with the purpose of manifesting the declaration that we have just made, the recognition of the one religion of the State as the Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church, and in consequence to pay our respects to His Holiness as the head of that Church." A year later, on April 3, 1824, the radical Rejón exclaimed before the same Congress: " When we state in the constitution what must be the religion of the Mexican Republic, it is due to the fact that we are living in a society that is Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman, and to give our constituents a testimony that we follow the same religion."[21] Pedro Celestino Negrete, afterward a rather violent antagonist, on presenting Iturbide to the nation, had declared: " We must first meet the exigencies which gave the primary impulse to the revolution, righting the ecclesiastical arrangements decreed by the Spanish Cortes."[22] His special point was the restoration of the suppressed religious Orders, the hospitaler Orders of San Juan, San Hipólito, and Belém, and the Jesuits, all of whom had been re-suppressed by the 1820 movement which Ferdinand VII swore to uphold upon his restoration in that year.[23] The Mexican Congress of 1823 had a solidly Masonic majority, and yet it stated that the Catholic religion was and would always be the religion of the State. It was only under the Yorkist regime in the time of Guerrero, and especially of Santa Anna and Gómez Farias, that a new turn was given to the regulation of religion.

---

[20] This peculiar matter is dealt with in Decorme, *op. cit.*, I, 309 f.

[21] Cf. Cuevas, *H. I. M.*, V, 180 ff.

[22] On Negrete see Decorme, *op. cit.*, I, 222.

Following the presentation of this necessary background, we are now in a position to review the relations of the government and the Church in the first decade of independence. After long and devious struggles, Congress finally agreed on suitable nominations of bishops and on a definite conclusion of the *patronato* affair.

The story opens under Iturbide. The independence movement, as Professor Whitaker points out in his recent *United States and Latin American Independence, 1800-1830,* was a direct result of the program enacted in Spain in 1820.[24] The government of Iturbide attacked the question immediately upon his triumphal entrance into Mexico. The Liberator, receiving the keys of the city, reiterated the Plan of Iguala in these words: " These are keys to gates which should be closed only against irreligion, disunion, and despotism, as they should be open to all that can make for the common happiness." On the next day, September 28, 1821, a regency was formed of Iturbide, O'Dónoju, Barcena, Yánez, and Velásquez. The *patronato* soon came up for consideration, as it was imperative to make provision for the many ecclesiastical posts then vacant.[25] In serious debate they argued whether the right of naming and presenting to all benefices had now passed from the Spanish throne to the Mexican nation. On October 19 the Regency consulted the Archbishop of Mexico, to ask that " Your Excellency point out in how far it is fitting that we achieve the objective [of filling benefices] while saving the right of the *patronato,* during the interim of negotiations on that point with the Holy See."[26] This last clause makes plain their will to treat the *patronato* as conditioned by the readiness of the papacy to recognize it.

---

[23] *Ibid.*, I, 186.

[24] Arthur Preston Whitaker, *The United States and the Independence of Latin America, 1800-1830* (Baltimore, 1941), p. 326 and *passim.*

[25] Cf. Bancroft, *op. cit.*, IV, 732 and 735.

The archbishop asked his chapter and the board of censors for their opinion. They divided the question into two parts, the actual provision for vacancies, and a recognition of the right of *patronato* in Mexico. On November 24 they gave their decision in these words:

> The *patronato*, conceded to the Kings of Spain, has ceased. For in virtue of devolution at law, it has returned to the diocesans to provide for ecclesiastical benefices, after giving previous notice of the elections to the government, so that, with the chosen persons found satisfactory, trustworthy, and with no bad record, the diocesans may go forward in their institution and placement.[27]

The first Congress opened its sessions in the old church of San Pedro y San Pablo (Jesuit), on February 24, 1822. Ten days later their interdiocesan committee, acting on the opinion given by the archbishop and his consultors, issued this congressional decree:

> Having met . . . to discuss and inform the Regency on the faculties which the chaplains of the army may obtain, and on the exercise of the *patronato* during the period of our incommunication with the Holy See, they [the junta] agree that: the chaplains may exercise their faculties in conformity with the ordinary and delegated powers given them by their bishops; and on the point of the *patronato*, they agree with the decisions of the Ecclesiastical Board of Censors of the Archbishopric and of the Venerable Chapter, to the effect that: by the independency of this Empire, the use of the *patronato* which the Holy See conceded to the Kings of Spain as Kings of Castile and Leon CEASES; and as that same power should be in our supreme government to avoid nullity in its [ecclesiastical] actions, it is necessary that we await that concession from the Holy See; meanwhile the provision of clerics of good repute, in whose presentation the *patronato* once acted, now devolves upon the respective diocesans, doing all in accord with canon law . . . yet excluding all subjects who for [sound] political reasons will not be found acceptable.[28]

---

[26] Cuevas, *H. I. M.*, V, 118.

[27] Decorme, *op. cit.*, I, 229.

[28] Cuevas, *Historia de la Nación Mexicana*, 488.

The Congress thus went on record as giving up any claim to the *patronato* as a right inherent in sovereignty, and they recognized its character as a privilege granted by the Church to the former rulers. On May 4 Congress approved the sending of an envoy to the Holy See with instructions specially designed by the bishops and accepted by Congress. He was to obtain recognition of the *patronato* in Mexico, and see to the filling of the vacancies of Valladolid, Monterrey, Chiapas, and Comayagua.[29] This envoy, José María Marchena, a Peruvian Dominican, was despatched by the provisional government on April 17, 1823.[30]

While this decision was in the making, a contrary move got under way.[31] There is extant the plan proposed by José Ignacio Espinosa, a member of the Junta, and dated December 19, 1821, aiming at an arrangement with the Holy See that would satisfy the regalists of Mexico. It claimed for the civil power privileges over the Church more extensive than those formerly held by the Spanish monarchs. The Regency, and in future the Emperor, would have the right of presentation of the archbishops, bishops, and the lower ecclesiastical benefices. To one of the bishops, or to the nuncio, should there be one, would pertain the expediting of bulls for the prelates presented by the government. The nation would be declared competent to determine the extension of the bishoprics and to erect new ones. The bishops would keep their extraordinary faculties in perpetuity, and in urgent cases they would have over their dioceses the same faculties that the pope has over the entire Church. Provinces of the diverse religious orders would have to unite into congregations with superiors-general or commissaries independent of Europe. Novices among regulars would not be bound to wear the habit before their twenty-first birthday, nor could they don it until after previous examination by the Alcalde, the Cura, and the Rector of the University. The nuncio must be a Mexican, and two of the Roman cardinals must likewise be Mexicans.

---

[29] Bancroft, *op. cit.*, V, 47, and Decorme, *op. cit.*, I, 229.

[30] Cuevas, *H. I. M.*, V, 164. For details on the 1823 Commission on the *Patronato* see Decorme, *op. cit.*, I, 278.

[31] The plan is outlined in Decorme, *op. cit.*, I, 229.

Fortunately for the Church this plan was voted down, but it indicates a new trend in Mexican ecclesiastical thought. Viceroy O'Dónoju had brought over with him the organization of the Scottish Rite, and it soon came to have a large influence in public life.[32] On December 5, 1821, the lodge called *El Sol* began the publication of the semiweekly newspaper of that name, under the editorship of a Spanish physician named Codorniú. The paper, as also the lodges, aimed to propagate the program of the 1820 Cortes, apparently supporting the Plan de Iguala, but in a way that would, in Gallican fashion, bring the Church increasingly under the authority of the State. This was a reflection of the ideas contained in the 1812 constitution, which, as will be remembered, was drawn up under the guns of the British fleet at Cadiz and expressed the current British statecraft toward continental religion. As the decade went forward, the lodges saw their purposes running contrary to the spirit of religion in Mexico, and then they began a propaganda representing the Church as the proper place for pious women, untaught children, and doddering old men. For the present, however, they marched in line with the popular sentiment, which saw in the late experience with the Spanish *patronato* a tyrannical power which not only disorganized economic conditions but flouted the religious feelings of the nation.

With the abdication of Iturbide on March 19, 1823, the whole constitutional question was reopened. On March 4 he had reconvened his Congress—it had been the dissolution of that body that brought on his fall—, and on March 29 it declared itself a legitimate national assembly. Bravo, Victoria, and Negrete became the provisional government. Bravo was an *Escosese* but also a profound Catholic. Victoria was never a Mason. Negrete was something of both.[33] The debate on the *patronato* question was intense and persistent, the direction of argument veering back and forth with the party lines of the conservatives, the *Escoseses,* and the *Partido Americano* of the *Yorkinos.*[34] Frequent shifts in party sentiment

---

[32] Bancroft, *op. cit.*, treats Masonry quite fully in dispersed chapters. See, for example, IV, 698-699, 781, 793-794; V, 32-34. Cuevas has a useful discussion of its Mexican beginnings in *H. I. M.*, V, *op. cit.*, 130-154. On *El Sol* see Decorme, I, 180.

[33] Cuevas, *H. I. M.*, V, 142. On the nature of the *patronato* debate consult Decorme, *op. cit.*, I, 280-283, where he also discusses the replies of publicists. The value of his work is in inverse ratio to its accessibility.

---

[34] Poinsett personally declared that Victoria was never a member of either lodge. (For this Cuevas, *H. I. M.*, V, 142, cites Poinsett to Clay, August 26, 1826, ms. in U. S. Department of State.) Cuevas reproduces a long letter of the Colombian Minister to Mexico, Miguel Santa María, to his government, as of 1825 (Cf. *Historia de la Nación Mexicana*, p. 523), wherein the control of the *Yorkinos* over the government is clearly presented. In translation it runs:

> In the Spring of this year [1825] came to Mexico Señor Poinsett, under the character of Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of the North.
>
> This individual, already famous in the history of the revolution of Chile and Buenos Aires, quickly showed himself as lacking in statesmanlike principles as he is skilled in the ways and tricks of serpentine intrigue. He contracted close relations with Esteva of the Ministry of Hacienda and the chief figures of the Party which can justly be termed the turbulent crowd.
>
> They began to create a new American Masonry, with authorization from North America, in opposition to the Scottish which is said to have been brought from Europe. It appears that the first one to approve the project was the President [Victoria], who proposed in this way to form an organized party in the hope thus to extinguish the *Escoseses.*
>
> On September 29, 1825, the Yorkist Grand Orient solemnly installed itself in the very house of Señor Poinsett, with the assistance of the President, the Minister of Hacienda, the Minister of Justice, and the principal dignitaries of that Secret Society. And if one can judge by the results, it was formed, under the pretext of upholding the federal form of the State, to propagate the pernicious effects of the most disorderly demagogy. It is incredible how rapidly proselytes rushed to affiliate with the new sect, which offers the allurement of governmental protection.
>
> All the beggars of the public treasury, of the official class and the military posts, men without education or character, energy or reputation, the offspring of the old disturbances and of the ruin of the fisc, in a word all those who have no way to make a living by their labor and personal deserts quickly came to make up the large part of that association. Some men of position, though of little wisdom, took out membership in the order, under the impression that it would furnish strong support to the Federal Constitution. So too some of the old nobility, ignorant and degraded men, entered the lodge for the sake of gaining a new popularity. Among them too, and taking active part, is General Guerrero, a coarse, venal, and vicious man. The consequence is that the republic is covered with Yorkist lodges and the country dominated by that faction. The resistance of sane people has been constant, but as they are moderate in their principles and conduct, and are afraid of interior convulsions that may drag the nation to the precipice of real anarchy, they have not stopped the progress of the opposition.
>
> The Yorkist recommendation is in the eyes of the government a title of preference in courts of justice and in political favor. But the greatest evil of all is the corruption and insubordination which this change has introduced into the army. The larger part of the trained leaders who are known for their honor and probity have been replaced by officials fanatically attached to the Yorkist party. The partiality of the President is

resulted in shifting instructions being sent to the envoys at Rome, Marchena, and later Vásquez. As an instance of this changing attitude one might compare the proposals for instructions in 1823, 1825, and the plan offered in 1826.

The political disturbances under Iturbide had prevented final treatment of the *patronato* issue and the despatch of an agent to Rome. After his abdication, the Commission of the Congress on the *Patronato*—Servando Mier, Felix Osores, Pablo Franco, Joaquín Román, and José María Iturralde—, on June 21, 1823, presented their report to Congress on the urgency and the method of resolving the debated question about Church and State through the agency of the Vatican.[35] The ex-monk Mier made it clear that his ideas did not agree with those of Archbishop Fonte, and that he would not vote to give up the *patronato,* as it was a right inherent in the nation to name bishops and administer church matters—that bishops might consult Rome but that the government had the final word. This platform was never accepted by Congress. On February 12, 1825, the Commission on (external) Relations presented a *dictamen* covering the instructions to be sent to the envoy (Vásquez) who would soon be despatched to Rome. They asked the Holy Father to continue the *patronato* in the Mexican nation and to extend the special episcopal faculties for twenty years. Congress approved this plan.[36] Then in 1826 the Senate Commission on Relations—Gómez Farias, Verduzco, Barrasa, García, Quintero, Martínez—proposed their program. They held that the *patronato* power was a usurpation of the papacy, and against the rights of the metropolitans, the canons of the primitive Church, and the Councils; that the papacy had despoiled the peoples of their natural right to choose their own pastors and give to the bishops the faculty, received di-

---

scandalous. The only remedy for this serious situation will come in a widespread reaction on the part of sane people or in some extraordinary calamity.

The laws made, and a great number of the agreements entered into by the House of Representatives, derive from the large majority who are furious partisans of the Yorkist sect. They regularly march out from their conventicles to the House of Congress, there to vote what they have previously decided in the lodge.

[35] For details on the 1823 Commission on the *Patronato* see Decorme, *op. cit.,* I, 278.

[36] Decorme, *op. cit.,* I, 284.

rectly from God, of forgiving all sins; that the primacy was an invention of the Roman Curia; that to the State belonged the maintaining of the canons in due observance, keeping purity in religious discipline, accepting or rejecting Roman decisions on discipline, and exercising the *patronato* exclusive of any Roman intervention; that, finally, the metropolitan could confirm the election of his suffragans and give definitive judgment to all church matters within the Republic.[37] Though strongly supported, this resolution failed to carry. It will be discussed again in a later connection.

The first agent to Rome sent by Mexico was Father Marchena.[38] On April 17, 1823, the provisional government, under congressional instructions as outlined above, despatched him to arrange for the *patronato* power. He was a man of little finesse, as the following will show. He was likewise a Mason of the *Escosese* persuasion. The sixth point of his instructions admonished him to "inquire at the court of Rome as he thinks proper about [recognition of] our independence, and find out if there is any disposition toward entering into concordats so as to arrange our ecclesiastical affairs." He wrote back from Rome to the government that he was disappointed at the Pope in rejecting his petition for bulls of appointment to bishoprics, because he had no credentials authorizing him to make that petition. "I had asked the favor," he wrote, "because it is a matter that would bring great revenues to our government."

His letter of January 29, 1824, is revealing:

> [Cardinal] Consalvi ... has received your letter. He showed both matters to the Pope. He called upon me to ask if your Excellency is still a member of the government, and I stated that you still were. This court, which is the poorest in the world, hopes for financial support from America. Meanwhile it desires to recognize you. The Vicar who was in Chile [Muzi] and those who were with him [including the future Pius IX, Mastai Ferretti] have no thought for anything but how to obtain money. And you know these Italians.

---

[37] *Ibid.*, I, 279-285.

[38] For this account of Marchena, Cuevas (*H. I. M.*, V, 157-158) drew his materials from the Alamán papers in the García Collection of the University of Texas.

19

Marchena's mention of money-grabbing is entirely in error, as he might have learned from the very instructions of Muzi.[39] The Spanish nunciature in Madrid had previously supplied all the funds for the support of ecclesiastical communications with America. This support was now ended. The Pope told Muzi to let it be known that he wanted Americans to begin to support their own church business, travel, and correspondence; that he wanted likewise to deal directly with them and have no more of the Spanish *patronato;* and that he had no mind to mix in politics nor to draw money from America.

A month after the previous letter of Marchena, and after his delegation as agent had been ended, he wrote from London (February 25, 1824):

> After I reached Rome, I began to inquire about the matters in my commission. I found that Pope Leo XII would gladly receive in private any commissioner sent by the Mexican government, and treat of all points that he proposed, but not those pertaining to [a recognition of] independence. For he said he could not recognize us until after all the nations [had done so], seeing that such is the custom of the Roman court. . . . I was able to say with frankness, since I have no idea of becoming a bishop, nor to get any favor from Montecaballo to Mr. Mazio and other friends of the Pope, that the Americans now see the day when they are out from under the heavy yoke of the Spaniards; that the people which is now becoming illustrious makes no distinction between French, Italians, Englishmen or Spaniards, but looks upon all Europeans as one and calls them *gachupines,* and has no confidence in any of them except in those who have shed their blood for independence; yet that it would not do to appoint an Italian [to our sees], but it would be good if one of our beloved bishops were appointed [as head, with power to consecrate others], or some other American from among the many great men that we have. And thus I stated that as the Apostolic Vicar he would be readily obeyed. To these and many other propositions of mine he replied by naming several men, nodding his head, and telling me that he has no quarrel with the King of Spain, etc. The wise govern-

---

[39] The originals of the papal instructions to Muzi for his mission to Buenos Aires are published by Pedro Leturia, "Rivadavia y Monsignor Muzi según fuentes inéditas del Vaticano," *Razón y Fe,* XCIX, 426 (1932, July), 334-348. Pius VII was succeeded on September 28, 1823, by Leo XII, who gave full approval to policy of his predecessor in the dealings with America.

> ment of Mexico, and yourself, Mr. Minister, who knows Rome well, will understand the instructions that should be given his [next] commissioner.

The successor to Marchena was Francisco Pablo Vásquez, a canon of Puebla. His instructions have been outlined above, as of February 12, 1825.[40] They were sent two and a half years later, October 9, 1827, after a delay whose causes are not at present altogether clear. They appointed him " Minister Plenipotentiary Before the Court of Rome ". The instructions read:

> 1. That His Holiness authorize the Mexican Nation to use the *patronato*, under which his churches have been regulated ever since their beginning here.
> 2. That the customary faculties be continued for the bishops during a period of twenty or more years, for the customary dispensation of impediments of consanguinity of the fourth, third and second degrees, with that of the first in the transversal line, and the first of affinity in *copula licita*.
> 3. That His Holiness declare the aggregation of the church of Chiapas with that of the archiepiscopal crozier of Mexico, and to that church extend the *patronato* as to a part of the nation.
> 4. That His Holiness provide for the superior government of the regulars, in accordance with the institutions of the Republic and the particular religious constitutions.
> 5. That the government, acting on this basis, send to its envoy all the explanations that it thinks convenient for fulfilling the object of his mission. Mexico, February 12, 1825.[41]

One reason for the delay of these instructions in leaving Mexico may have been the historically puzzling event of the disputed bull of Leo XII, *Etsi jam diu.*[42] It has been argued that this bull held back the settlement of good relations between Mexico and the papacy. The story is much involved. Many pages have been written on the authenticity of the bull. Mecham thinks that, despite its contradictory nature, it was really given papal approval. On the other hand Leturia has submitted it to detailed study, as has Cuevas, and these scholars throw great doubt upon its papal origin, preferring to make it a product of Vargas, the Spanish ambassador at Rome, and of some papal secretary acting in collusion with him. It would not be the first spurious Roman document.

---

[40] Cuevas, *H. I. M.*, V, 158; Decorme, *op. cit.*, I, 284.

[41] Cuevas, *H. I. M.*, V, 180.

[42] See Bancroft, *op. cit.*, VI, 580; Cuevas, *H. I. M.*, V, 165-187; Decorme, *op. cit.*, I, 276; Mecham, *op. cit.*, pp. 165-167; Pedro Leturia, *El Ocaso del Patronato Real en la América Española* (Madrid, 1825).

The Latin copy is dated at Rome, September 24, 1824. The Spanish copy appeared in *La Gazeta de Madrid* on February 10, 1825, with important changes from the Latin copy, especially in its introducing a clear condemnation of the revolutionary movements in America. The original of the bull has not been found, and it is not recorded in any official list of papal publications. The government of Mexico published it in its Spanish text. Our purpose here is not to restate the textual criticism. The point is that, in its Spanish form, it urged the American bishops (with the change from the first Latin version "To the Bishops of South America" to the later Latin "To the Bishops of America") that they bring their people to support Ferdinand VII and cease their rebellion.

Now, were this a genuine expression of papal opinion, it is hard to see how Leo XII could have written another letter (whose text is still preserved) to General Guadalupe Victoria, then president of Mexico, under date of June 29, 1825. This letter was published in *La Aguila Mexicana* (No. 226), November 27, 1825. Though it does not afford a formal recognition for independent Mexico, it does offer a clear sign of the papal wish to grant every possible favor to the government of Mexico, while still keeping clear of the political question. It came in response to a letter from Victoria to Leo XII (whose text is not known today.) The letter of the Pontiff follows:

> Leo XII, Pope. Dear son: health and apostolic benediction. With great satisfaction we received the letter which you kindly directed to us on October 30 of the past year, together with many documents of varying nature that accompanied it. Our particular character, and the dignity to which, without any merit, we have been elevated, demand that we do not become involved in things that in no way pertain to the regimen of the Church. And so we content ourselves in this present with giving you merited thanks for the consideration with which we have been rewarded, and we CONGRATULATE YOU ON THE PEACE AND CONCORD WHICH YOU ASSURE US THE MEXICAN NATION ENJOYS BY THE FAVOR OF GOD. Assuredly your constancy in the

> Catholic faith and your veneration for the Apostolic See entitle you to the highest commendation, as we have with reason believed you worthy to be numbered among the sons whom we most love in Jesus Christ. And for what touches your particular attachment to our person and to sacred things, seeing that you promise that you will never be wanting in support of the Church, hold for certain that we have seen this manifestation with great joy, and we pray God to inspire us and aid us to see this holy determination fulfilled. Meanwhile, in proof of our love, not only for you but for all the Mexican people, we give the Apostolic Benediction with all the effusion of a paternal heart.
>
> Given at St. Peter's, in Rome, June 29, 1825, the second year of our pontificate. Leo XII, Pope. To our beloved son, the illustrious leader Don Guadalupe Victoria.[43]

This letter makes it clear that the Pope should not be held responsible for the grotesque eulogy to Ferdinand VII contained in the bull, namely, that he " considers nothing more than religion and the happiness of his subjects." Nor could he well have issued the condemnation of Mexican independence—so contrary to his sentiments in this letter—, a condemnation that does not appear in the first Latin text that we have, if it ever appeared at all in a document approved by the Pope.

The letter did produce bad effects in Mexico. Pérez, Bishop of Puebla, is said to have made some violent comments as he read it to his priests from the official Mexican copy.[44] And as he had long been a leading spirit in the movement for independence—in the Iturbide revolution, afterward in the first *Junta*—and an important critic of congressional action, his reaction can safely be said to have represented that of a large group in Mexico.

From another point of view, the letter seems to have given the long-sought opportunity to Gómez Farias, Mier, Poinsett, and the *Yorkino* faction, to attempt the formation of a national church, under the guise of a new *patronato* scheme contained in the plan of instructions for the new Roman envoy, Vásquez. The plan was drawn up on February 20, 1826, but was debated in Congress only on September 4, 1827. It follows:

---

[43] The full text is given in Cuevas, *H. I. M.*, V, 168.

[44] See the long footnote in Decorme, *op. cit.*, I, 276.

> 1. The envoy to the Roman Pontiff will negotiate to have His Holiness confirm for the episcopal see of the [Federal] District, for the bishoprics that we ought to have in all the States of the Union, and for the auxiliary sees of New Mexico and both the Californias, those individuals whom, according to the determination of the law, the President of the Republic will present.
> 2. He will negotiate [a plan] for their succession, [so that] the metropolitan, and in the event of his absence the oldest bishop of the Republic, will ratify new dioceses to be created, combining of old ones, dismembering or suppressing archbishoprics or bishoprics as National Congress decides.
> 3. He will, finally, negotiate that the same metropolitan, and in his absence the oldest other bishop, will confirm in union with his suffragan [comprovincial] or suffragans those who are presented by the General Congress for archiepiscopal or episcopal sees that may be vacated or that shall be decreed vacated. (Hall of Commissions of the Senate. Mexico, September 4, 1827. (Names.) [45]

This apparently simple plan was devised from an earlier sketch of the apostate bishop Gregoire of Blois to separate Mexico from the Roman communion. A great storm was raised over it by Bishop Pérez and Father Arrillaga, a noted publicist of the day, and as a result of the protest the proposal was dropped. In its place were substituted the instructions which Congress had earlier accepted in 1825, and on October 9, 1827, they were voted and sent to Vásquez as the " Minister Plenipotentiary Before the Court at Rome "—who, incidentally, had not yet been received in Rome as an accredited envoy. On July 23, 1828, Leo XII felicitated President Victoria for his courageous attitude in this matter, and he promised a quick rejuvenation of the Mexican church.[46] The instructions have been quoted in full above.[47]

Vásquez had sailed from Vera Cruz for Europe on May 21, 1825.[48]

---

[45] Reproduced in Cuevas, *H. I. M.*, V, 171.

[46] Cited by Decorme, *op. cit.*, I, 285. This halting and shifting of instructions led Alamán to state that the debate on the question was deliberately kept alive to put off as long as possible any final agreement. Cleven, *op. cit.*, regrets that the Church in Mexico did not develop a leadership that would have countered the action of the lodges. He evidently expected a political miracle of the first water.

[47] See p. ——.

[48] Decorme, *op. cit.*, I, 283.

Professor Mecham has outlined his course for the next five years, and the reasons why he met no success during that time. The chief obstacle in his path was the instruction of his government that he be received as a diplomatic envoy of a recognized nation. It was this that caused his absence on May 21, 1827, when he would certainly have obtained what he most wanted, the filling of the episcopal vacancies. For on that day, Leo XII preconized the candidates presented by Colombia, in spite of the objections of the Spanish crown. Moreover, his government charged him to obtain the grant of the *patronato* concomitant with the appointment of bishops. The Holy See was unable to yield on this point. The recent history of the *patronato* precluded any such concession, especially to the lodge-ridden regime of Mexico, and for the further reason that the first independent government of Mexico had clearly declared that the *patronato* had ceased to exist. The papacy wanted no more *patronato.* And Vásquez himself refused to act in his position as minister plenipotentiary, a status whose notification came to him while he was at Florence in 1829. He offered to resign rather than press for the exorbitant pretentions of his government.[49]

The resolution of the decade of struggle came through the work of President Bustamente, whose rule—from January, 1830, to December, 1832—followed the nine short months of the Guerrero regime. It is true that Guerrero and his ministers had continued the Roman efforts, but their action was not accepted in good faith either by Vásquez or by the Roman Curia. Their nominees, men of the stamp of Alpulche and Aguilera, were utterly unworthy, and their request for mere vicars apostolic rather than for proprietary bishops offended the national spirit as well as the good sense of their able envoy.[50]

Bustamente had a congress similar to that of his predecessor, but he and his minister of justice and ecclesiastical affairs, José Ignacio Espinosa, induced the deputies to agree to rewrite the instructions to Vásquez, leaving the *patronato* to future approval, and being content for the time with provisions for the needed bishops. On February 17, 1830, Congress accepted the program. They decided to present one name out of those nominated by the chapters of each diocese, and to ask the Pope to appoint them *motu proprio* for the respective churches. On March 5, 1830, Bustamente sent the name of Francisco Pablo Vásquez for Puebla.[51]

---

[49] Cuevas, *H. I. M.*, V, 159.

[50] Decorme, *op. cit,* I, 301.

On July 30, 1830, Vásquez was finally received by the Curia. He was to conclude an agreement whose primary condition was the nomination of proprietary bishops. To his dismay he saw that the Consistorial Commission was not disposed to grant titular bishops but merely bishops *in partibus*. On this occasion he delivered a respectful but energetic address. Declining to accept the nominations, including his own, he said:

> To do this would reduce the Mexican church to a state more unhappy than what it had in its infancy when it was composed only of neophytes. For the nominations of bishops *in partibus* are the petition neither of the Republic nor of the Mexican Church, and so, for their honor, they resist an ignominious retrogression which offends their good name before the Catholic world. They do not ask for vicars apostolic, for such cannot satisfy the necessities of those churches, which, because of their distance from the Holy See, and their long vacancy, demand an episcopal authority in all its plenitude, in all its splendor, and with all the prestige that it has ever had in Mexico.[52].

The reigning pontiff, Pius VIII, died before he might take that step in the face of Spanish hostility. But his successor, Gregory XVI, faced the situation boldly. In his bull, *Solicitudo Ecclesiarum,* August, 1831, he told the nations concerned that he meant to end the impasse by exercising his spiritual functions without any fear of the consequences. The bull was an echo of his decisive move of February 28. On that day he held his first consistory and preconized bishops for the Mexican sees of Puebla, Guadalajara, Michoacán, Durango, Linares, and Chiapas. On March 6 Vásquez was consecrated by Cardinal Odescalchi.[53] He returned at once to Mexico and personally consecrated the other prelates.

---

[51] *Ibid.*, I, 300.

[52] Quoted in Cuevas, *H. I. M.*, V, 159. See Mecham, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

[53] Decorme, *op. cit.*, I, 302.

The government of Bustamente has been called "clerical" because of this event. The term is misapplied. In reality the Church in Mexico had no representative clergy in politics during this period aside from Vásquez in Rome. The lay politicians, even Alamán, the brain of Bustamante, were far from that disposition of mind which would accept political direction from clerical leaders, had there been any such to guide them. As a matter of fact, the Church was on the defensive, in its hierarchical organization, its principles, and the freedom needed to carry on its work. As soon as Santa Anna, with the help of Gómez Farias, overthrew Bustamante, the Congress decreed, as of May 21, 1833, that the *patronato* had been in force all the time, because it was a right radically residing in the nation.[54] And they tried, vainly it is true, to force all the bishops and religious superiors to swear to uphold their stand.

The first decade of national independence saw the Church in Mexico recover from the disorganization of revolutionary times. It saw the definite ending of the *patronato,* that fertile cause of American rebellion. It likewise witnessed the rise of a new spirit in the Yorkist *Partido Americano,* which would, through a many-sided attack on the religious inheritance of the nation, carry on the ideas and the party grouping of the eighteen twenties to the enactment of the Lerdo-Juarez laws of 1857. While the decade marked the end of colonial absolutism, it soon came to be considered a conservative period, as the politicians swept the country on to the completely lay state of later days.

W. EUGENE SHIELS

Loyola University
Chicago

[54] *Ibid.*, I, 303.

MISCELLANY

I

Some Additions and Corrections to *Early Catholic Americana*

In the following list are given only editions of French works in English translation which are omitted in Father Wilfrid Parsons' *Early Catholic Americana* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1939). The additions along with certain corrections are taken from the MS. of a forthcoming work on French translations printed in America before 1820. The number of items below is further limited by giving new entries only through the year 1800. To give the omitted editions after 1800 would make a list too long for one article. The list is still further limited by the omission of works which are French textbooks, works in French, and American compilations having only short translated extracts by French authors.

Regarding extracts, it may be interesting to note that school readers sometimes include choice selections from Catholic authors. One good example of this is Lindley Murray's *The English Reader,* which has two extracts from Fénelon; one entitled, " The vices and follies of men should excite compassion rather than ridicule; " and the other, " Genuine virtue commands respect, even from the bad." Now these two extracts occupy about ten pages and are found in almost all editions of Murray's *The English Reader.* Ninety-nine editions of these Murray readers, printed in America before 1820, have been found to include the two Fénelon extracts.

Another example of an extract is the Abbé Fauchet's five-page " Extract from the eulogy on Dr. Franklin, in the name of the Commons of Paris, 1790." This is found in at least twenty-four editions of Caleb Bingham's *The Columbian Orator,* printed before 1820. The same extract on Franklin is found in several editions of Rufus W. Adams' *The Young Gentleman and Lady's Explanatory Monitor.* A short extract (4-5 pages) entitled " Thoughts on death; translated from the moral essays of Mess. de Port-Royal " appears in about six editions of Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe's *Friendship in Death.* Four editions of Rowe's work were printed in America before 1800. Charles Rollin's " On the duty of schoolboys " appears in at least fifty-two editions of Caleb Bingham's *The American Preceptor,* printed between 1794 and 1820. The same Rollin extract is printed in several editions of Abner Alden's *The Reader,* and in about a dozen editions of J. Moore's *The Young Gentleman and Lady's Monitor.* Other extracts by Rollin are found in Joseph Chandler's *The Young Gentleman and Lady's*

Museum, in Joseph Dana's *A New American Selection,* and in John Walker's *Elements of Elocution.*

When one considers that other French Catholic authors, such as Mme. de Genlis, are now and then found hidden in compilations, it readily becomes evident that this sort of material may be important. It perhaps should not be lost sight of in evaluating Catholic literature in early America. It is not suggested, however, that too much time be spent in searching for these small extracts in compilations. The results would hardly be commensurate with the labor.

What is needed is as complete a list as possible of the bona fide Catholic works printed in early America. This list might well include the larger extracts found in compilations. The task of identifying the Catholic authors and finding the editions is enormous for one man, and he needs the help of others. It is with this idea in mind that the author of the following additions has offered his assistance. This is a help which others also could render. Librarians and co-workers of Father Parsons, in checking certain items, could send in new titles, thus rendering valuable service.

The list below is divided into two parts. The first division contains new editions and corrections of works or authors already listed in *Early Catholic Americana.* Entries already in Father Parsons' work are not repeated except when major corrections are made, erroneous attributions pointed out, and some locations given for items listed without locations. If Father Parsons lists an author as Catholic no attempt is made to disprove this. Neither is any great attempt made to list authors not already accepted as Catholic. However, about a dozen new authors who are apparently Catholic are listed, and, as there may be some reason for not accepting them, they are entered in the second division.

The small second division (consisting of new authors) includes Father François d'Aix de la Chaise, whose pamphlet bearing the imprint of Philadelphia, and printed about 1688, antedates the earliest entry in *Early Catholic Americana* (Seguenot's Letter, 1729) by about forty-one years. The omission of Father La Chaise's letter may have been due to belief that the work was not by this French priest. That is true. The French original, listed in the Bibliothèque Nationale catalogue under La Chaise, is said to be apocryphal. An examination of the French original in the Paris library revealed that the version in English is a translation. Not only is the La Chaise letter a hoax, but it is not certain the work was actually printed in Philadelphia. It was probably printed in England. But even though the author is apocryphal and the imprint fictitious, it would seem fitting to list it, making an attempt to clear it up in some way (see item 67).

Another author who is evidently Catholic is Pierre Abélard. The letters of Abélard and Héloise were published at Philadelphia in 1775 and again in

1796. The poem "Eloisa to Abelard," included in the two editions, is by Mr. Alexander Pope and therefore by a Catholic (see items 70 and 71). *The Royal Convert*, written by the "Messieurs of Port-Royal," is another work which may be Catholic, unless it is a hoax, and this has not been proven. The work is now anonymous, though some have attributed it to Antoine Arnauld and Pierre Nicole. It has been impossible to find a French original listed in Port Royal bibliographies, and so, for the time being, *The Royal Convert* is only a probable French translation of a work written by the "Messieurs de Port-Royal." There are four editions of this work printed in America before 1800 (see items 74-77). Still another Catholic is Laurent Bordelon. He is listed in biographies as a theologian and abbé. Therefore his *The Management of the Tongue* should be included in a list of Catholic works (see items 72-73).

An extract from Charlevoix, the French Jesuit, occupies the last fourth of a pamphlet printed at Boston in 1746 (see item 68). In *The Works of the Late Dr. Benjamin Franklin* (New York, 1794) is the Abbé Claude Fauchet's *Eulogium on Benjamin Franklin,* occupying pages 173 to 206 (see item 81). A very rare pamphlet is Citoyen Godineau's eight-page *Oration upon Religious Worship,* printed at Philadelphia about 1798 by Benjamin Franklin Bache. The work was recently purchased by Mrs. S. Hornor, collector of Philadelphia imprints, from Mr. C. P. Everitt, dealer in Americana. Mr. Everitt regarded the maxims of the pamphlet so highly that he reprinted one hundred copies for distribution to his friends. (See item 84). Several works by Henri Baptiste Grégoire, constitutional bishop of Blois, were printed in our early national period. The only work of his appearing before 1800 is the report to the National Convention entitled: *Report on the Means of Compleating*[!] *and Distributing the National Library,* Philadelphia, 1794 (see item 82). The French Jesuits, Louis Daniel le Comte and Jean Baptiste Du Halde's *A Description of China* appeared in *The World Displayed* (Phila., 1795-6, Vol. 6, pp. 184-247). (See item 83.) At least two editions of the Abbé Nicolas Lenglet-Dufresnoy's geography for children appeared in the same period. The first edition was printed at Philadelphia about 1798 (see item 85). Several editions of *The Travels of Cyrus,* by Andrew Michael Ramsay, Fénelon's convert to Catholicism, were printed in early America. Three editions appeared before 1800 (see items 78-80). Pierre Augustin Boissier de Sauvages de la Croix's *Directions for the Breeding and Management of Silkworms* was printed at Philadelphia in 1770. According to the *Grande Dictionnaire,* Sauvages de la Croix was ordained a priest at the age of sixty. This left him twenty-five long years in which to officiate. It was the year he was ordained that he published his treatise on silkworms. (See item 69.)

Concerning new editions by authors already listed by Father Parsons, it is noteworthy that the date of the hitherto earliest known American edition of a Catholic work, that of 1729, is, in the following list of additions, 1724. Cordier's select colloquies in Latin and English is earlier than Seguenot's 1729 edition of his *Letter* by five years. This leaves out of consideration the spurious Philadelphia, 1688 edition of La Chaise's pamphlet and an unseen Cambridge, 1667 edition of Thomas à Kempis' *The Imitation of Christ*. The 1667 edition of Thomas à Kempis' work is listed in Evans 114 as a publication approved by the licensers and " now in the Presse." The court, however, ordered a new review of the work and cessation of the printing (see item 1).

It may be further pointed out that twelve new entries are made for Madame de Genlis before 1800. About the same number of new entries for this same author could be made for the period from 1801 to 1820. There are also ten additions for Fénelon, for Le Sage eight additions, for Cordier seven, for La Rochefoucauld seven, for Jeanne de la Nativité four, for D'Ancourt four, for Fleury two, for Caraccioli two, and for ten other authors one addition each. For the authors not previously entered there are four editions for *The Royal Convert,* three editions for Ramsay, for Bordelon two, for Abélard two, and for eight authors one edition each. This makes a total of eighty-five additions, including corrections of entries already made.

While no bibliography is ever complete, yet it is continually nearing completeness. Father Parsons realized this when in the Preface of his *Early Catholic Americana* he asked for corrections of errors of omission and commission. If anyone, knowing of an omitted item or correction, would send it to Father Parsons, it is certain he would appreciate it. It is understood that a new edition or supplement will appear at some future time. This enlarged edition will be quite useful to literary historians when they come to weigh Catholic literature in early America.

In the following list, works by the same author are grouped together to permit dittoing when a title is the same as (or similar to) a preceding title. Authors are listed according to the chronological appearance of new entries, and not according to a strict alphabetical arrangement. As the list concerns the study of a subject, rather than a bibliographical description, slight difference in spelling, word order, or punctuation are not indicated in the dittoing. The libraries in which works were examined and described are indicated by Union List abbreviations in black type. Abbreviations of other libraries supposed to own copies are given, but since copies were not always seen in these libraries, it is not certain the works can always be found there. The author's own copies are indicated by giving his name. In instances where the author owns a microfilm reproduction of some library copy, this will be indicated by the following form: author + film fac. + library.

FORREST B. BOWE

St. John's University
Brooklyn

NEW EDITIONS OF WORKS OR AUTHORS PREVIOUSLY LISTED IN *Early Catholic Americana*

1 **Thomas à Kempis**, 1379-1471. The imitation of Christ... Cambridge, Cambridge, Pr. by Samuel Green, 1667. [Evans 114]

"The publication of this work was approved by the Licensers of the Press; but the 'Court being informed that there is now in the Presse reprinting, a book that imitates of Christ, or to that purpose, written by Thomas Kempis a Popish minister, wherein is contayned some things that are lease safe to be infused amongst the people of this place, doe commend to the licensers of the Presse the more full revisale thereof, and that in the meane time there be no further progresse in that work'" (cf. Evans 114.)

This 1667 ed. of a translation from the Latin, although not in Parsons, would seem to deserve inclusion, since non-located items are regularly listed by him. Although the printing of the work was probably never completed, the entry might show why the proposed publication of some Catholic works were not made previous to 1729 or thereabouts.

2 **Cordier, Mathurin**, 1479-1564. Corderii colloquiorum centuria selecta; or, A select century of Cordery's colloquies: with an English translation as literal as possible, design'd for the use of beginners in the Latin tongue. By John Clarke... The 3d ed., Boston, Pr. for Benjamin Eliot and Daniel Henchman, 1724. vi, 168 p. 14.5cm. **MH**;MB

Latin and English in parallel columns.

3 —— ——— The 20th ed. Boston, Pr. in the year 1770. v, 199 p. 13cm. **MH**;MB;RPJCB

4 —— ——— The 22d ed. Phila., Pr. and sold by Joseph Crukshank, 1777. vii, 170 p. 16.5cm. **Bowe**

5 —— ——— London Pr., and N. Y., Re-pr. by Hugh Gaine, 1786. vi, 170 p. 15.5cm. **Bowe**;NN

Parsons 58, with no copy located.

6 —— ——— N. Y., Pr. by Hugh Gaine, at the Bible, in Hanover-Square, 1792. [Evans 24228]

7 —— ——— A new ed., carefully cor., and compared with the 26th London ed. Exeter, Pr. by H. Ranlet, for I. Thomas & E. T. Andrews, March, 1800. viii, 170 p. 15cm. **RPJCB**;DLC;MH

8 —— Corderii colloquia or Cordery's colloquies, with a translation of the first forties, etc. By James Hardie. Newark, Jacob Halsey, 1800. 12° [Plaza Book Auction Co., A collection of rare books from the library of A. P. Moore. Sale No. 101, Feb. 1 and 2, 1933].

9 **[Jeanne de la Nativité]** fl. 1650. Daily conversation with God, exemplified in the holy life of Armelle Nicholas, a poor ignorant country

maid in France, commonly known by the name of the Good Armelle deceas'd in Bretaigne in the year 1671. Done out of the French. Phila., Pr. and sold by B. Franklin, 1741. [Evans 4732]

This uncollated and unlocated Evans item would seem to belong to *Early Catholic Americana,* because other non-located items are included.

10 [——] ——— [5 ll. from the Bible] London pr.; Phila., Repr. by Henry Miller, in Second-Street, 1767. 24 p. 17cm. **Bowe**;MH;MWA;NN;PHi

A different ed. from Parsons item 21.

Bound with: Philalethes [pseud.] Christian piety . . . 3d ed. With the life of Armelle Nicolas. London pr.; Phila., Repr. by Henry Miller in Second-Street, 1766. The *Daily conversation* has special t. p. and pagination.

11 [——] A Christian's daily conversation with God, exemplified in a short extract of the holy life of Armelle Nicolas. (In The **folly** and vanity of a life spent in the pursuit of worldly profit... Phila., Pr. by John Dunlap, 1770. p. [13]-21. 16.5cm.) **Bowe**;MWA;NN

12 [——] The blessed effects of a holy life and daily conversation with God, exemplified in a short extract of the life of Armelle Nicolas, a poor ignorant country maid. [Phila., Pr. by Joseph Crukshank, 1780?] 12 p. 16.5cm. **NJP**;MWA;PHC;PPAmP;PPL

Caption title. Caption title for text begins: A Christian's daily conversation with God.

No. 2 in a vol. of pamphlets of which the first is [Benezet, Anthony] Christian piety . . . by Philalethes . . .

This Parsons item 35, taken from Evans 16811, gives no location.

13 **Ancourt d'**, abbé. The lady's preceptor; or, A letter to a young lady of distinction upon politeness. Woodbridge, N. J., J. Parker, 1754. 12mo. [Amer. Book Prices Current, vol. for 1929-30, under D'Ancourt, abbé.]

According to the A.B.P.C. a copy of this Woodbridge, N. J., 1754 ed. was sold at S. V. Henkel's auction of rare Americana on June 11, 1929, for $23.50.

14 —— The lady's preceptor. Or, A letter to a young lady of distinction upon politeness. Taken from the French of the Abbé d'Ancourt, and adapted to the religion, customs, and manners of the English nation. By a gentleman of Cambridge. [5 ll. from Milton] The 5th ed. London, Pr.; Woodbridge, in New-Jersey, Re-pr. and sold by James Parker, 1759. [2], 56 p. 18.5cm. **Bowe** film fac. **NjHi**

15 —— ——— The 6th ed. London pr.; Woodbridge, in New-Jersey; Re-pr. and sold by James Parker, 1762. [2], 56 p. 23cm. **NN**;MWA

Evans 9056 with no copy located.

16 ——— The lady's preceptor, or, A letter to a young lady of distinction, upon politeness. Taken from the French of the Abbé d'Ancourt, & adapted to the religion, customs, & manners of the U. S. Sag-Harbor, Pr. by David Frothingham, 1798. [Evans 33302]

17 The **uncertainty** of a death-bed repentance. illustrated under the character of Penitens. [Germantown, Pr. by Christopher Sowr, Jr., 1756?] 16 p. 16.5cm. **Bowe** film fac. **PHi**

Contents.—The uncertainty of a death-bed repentance, illus. under the character of Penitens. p. [1]-6.—If any man hath ears to hear let him hear . . . p. 7-13.—Directions for a holy life. By the Arch-bishop of Cambray. p. 13-16.

Hildeburn lists a 1756 ed. under Fénelon. Evans brackets in the above imprint without a query, and attributes it to Fénelon. Parsons lists several editions of the work under Fénelon. Merrill's magazine article, "Catholic authorship in the American colonies before 1784," in the *Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. III, No. 3 (Oct., 1917), item 22, attributes the work to Fénelon. Despite the attribution of the work to Fénelon in catalogues and libraries, the ascription is evidently erroneous. A search in several editions of Fénelon's complete works has failed to locate a French original. It is unlikely that Fénelon is the author of this tract. The error probably started from the fact that the last added work, *Directions for a holy life* (p. 13-16), in the pamphlet having title *The uncertainty of a death-bed repentance*, is signed by Fénelon.

18 —— ——— (In [**Benezet**, **Anthony**] Observations on the inslaving, importing and purchasing of negroes . . . 2d ed. Germantown, Pr., by Christopher Sower, 1760. p. [12]-16 19cm.) **Bowe**;DLC;MH;MWA;NN;PHi;PPL

Parsons 15 lists the following under Fénelon:

> The uncertainty of a deathbed repentance, illustrated under the character of Penitens. [Germantown, Pr. by Christopher Sower, 1760] 16 p. 8vo. PPL

This Parsons item cannot be found in PPL. Apparently what was found was the analytical paged [12]-16 in Benezet's work. So, even though Fénelon was the author, not of *The uncertainty* . . . , but of a small part of the collection printed in [1756?], this is not true for the 1760 ed. Parsons item 15, then, should be deleted because the work is not by Fénelon, nor is there an extract by him in the work, as was the case for the [1756?] ed. in PHi.

19 —— ——— [Germantown, Pr. by Christoph Saur, 1766?] 16 p. 16cm. **Bowe** fil fac. **DLC**;PPFr

Parsons item 20, with no copy located.

A different ed. from the [1756?] ed., as revealed by comparison of the two Bowe films.

Contents.—The uncertainty of a death-bed repentance, illus. under the character of Penitens. p. [1]-6.—If any man hath ears to hear let him hear . . . p. 7-13. — Directions for a holy life. By the Arch-bishop of Cambray. p. 13-16.

20 —— ——— (In [**Benezet, Anthony**] Some serious and awful considerations... Phila., Pr. by Joseph Crukshank [1769?] p. 4-12. 16.5cm.)
Bowe film fac. **PHi**;MH;MWA

This entry does not include Fénelon's *Directions for a holy life*.

21 **Racine, Jean**, 1639-1699. The distrest mother; a tragedy. Tr. by Ambrose Philips from the Andromaque of Racine. N. Y., Pr. by Hugh Gaine, 1761. [Evans 8986; Parsons 17; etc.]

At least half a dozen works have already listed Racine's *The distrest mother* as the first purely literary French translation printed in the United States. This Racine item, though listed by Evans and others, was probably never printed in America. It seems proper, however, to list it, giving Evans as the authority. But it is also fitting to point out that since Evans does not give an authority for the entry, it must not be accepted as final until a copy is found. Evans probably catalogued an English edition advertised for sale by Hugh Gaine. P. L. Ford does not list Racine's play among the works printed by Hugh Gaine. (Cf. Bowe, " Recherches sur Racine dans l'Amérique du Nord " in *Revue de litt. comp.*, Année 19, No. 4 (Oct.-Déc., 1939), p. 643-5).

The first known American ed. of Racine's *The distrest mother* was printed at Boston in 1822. This 1822 ed. is not in Parsons' work on American imprints before 1830.

22 **Louis XVI**, King of France. Louis, by the grace of God, king of France and Navarre, to all who shall see these presents, greeting. [Lancaster, Pr. by Francis Bailey, 1778] 2 p. 27cm. **PPL**

Parsons' item 31, under the year 1779, is apparently the same as his item 27, under 1778. The imprint for the work should be bracketed in and the date of 1778 given as the more approximate one.

23 [**Caraccioli, Louis Antoine de**] 1721-1803. Advice from a lady of quality to her children; in the last stage of a lingering illness. Tr. from the French by S. Glasse... Phila, Pr. and sold by Young and M'Culloch, 1786. 2 v. in 1. [Evans 19454]

24 [——] ——— The 3d ed. Newbury-Port, Pr. by John Mycall, for William Green, Boston [1789] 2 v. 15.5cm.
Bowe;CSmH;MB;MH;MWA

This 1789 ed. is listed anonymously in Parsons 72. Likewise his 1796 ed. (item 150) is given anonymously. Father Parsons evidently enters the work because the author—the so-called "lady of quality"—devotes one chapter to her son, a priest. Now the question is to determine whether Caraccioli was a Catholic. It seems he was, for the *Grande encyclopédie* says he was a member of the Oratory.

Translation of: Les derniers adieux de la Maréchale de * * *, à ses enfants, par l'auteur de la conversation avec soi-même [L. A. de Caraccioli] Paris, 1769 (cf. Bibliothèque Nationale).

25 **Genlis, Stéphanie Félicité Ducrest de Saint-Aubin,** comtesse de, afterwards marquise de Sillery, 1746-1830. Alphonso and Dalinda: or, The magic of art and nature. A moral tale. Written in French by Madame la Comtesse de Genlis. Tr. into English by Thomas Holcroft. A new ed. Phila., Pr. for Thomas Dobson, 1787. viii, [9]-240 p. 16.5cm. **Bowe**;DLC;PHi;PPL

26 —— —— N. Y., Pr. for John Reid, No. 17 Water-Street, 1788. [Evans 21106]

27 —— —— Pr. at Fairhaven, 1799. viii, [9]-216 p. 17cm. **Bowe**;OCIWHi

28 —— Beauties of Madam Genlis, being a select collection of the most beautiful tales and other striking extracts from Adela and Theodore, and Tales of the castle; the Theatre of education, and Sacred dramas. Phila., 1791. [Evans 23406]

29 —— The beauty and the monster. A comedy. From the French of the Countess de Genlis. Extracted from the Theatre of education. Worcester, Mass., Pr. by Isaiah Thomas, and sold at his book-store, 1785. 35 p. 14.5cm. **RPJCB**;PP(Rosenbach)

30 —— The castle of truth, a moral tale. From The tales of the castle. By the Countess de Genlis. Phila., Pr. and sold by Stewart & Cochran, 1795. 143 p. 17cm. **NN**;MB;MWA;NN;PHi;PPL;RPJCB

31 —— The child of nature. A dramatic piece, in four acts. From the French of Madame the Marchioness of Sillery, formerly Countess of Genlis. Phila., Pr. and sold by William Spotswood, 1790. 68, [4] p. 16cm. **Bowe**;MWA;BM

For another issue see Le Sage's *The comical adventures of Gil Blas* . . . Phila., 1790.

32 [——] Hagar of the desert. Tr. from the French, for the use of children. The 4th ed. Worcester, Mass., Pr. by Isaiah Thomas, 1785. 32 p. front. 11cm. **MWA**;PP(Rosenbach)

33 [——] —— Newbury-Port, Pr. and sold by John Mycall [1790?] 24 p. 17cm. **RPB**

34 [——]The history of the Duchess of C*****. From Adela and Theodore. Written by herself. To which is added, Edwin and Angelina, a ballad. Northampton, Pr. by Andrew Wright, for Simeon Butler, 1798. 142 p. 14cm. **Bowe**;CSmH;MWA

35 —— Sacred dramas, written in French, by Madame la Comtesse de Genlis. Tr. into English, by Thomas Holcroft... Fredericksburg, Pr. by L. A. Mullin, for the Rev. Mason L. Weems, 1797. viii, 136 p. 16.5cm. **Bowe**;DLC;MH;NB;NN

36 —— Sylvan. The shepherd twain. A new song. Composed by R. Taylor. The words taken from "The knights of the swan." Written by the Countess de Genlis. Phila., Pub. by B. Carr, at his Repository, Market St., 1798. [Evans 33786]

37 **Guyon, Jeanne Marie (Bouvier de la Motte)**, 1648-1717. The worship of God, in spirit and in truth: or, A short and easy method of prayer, suited to every capacity; with two letters upon the same subject. By Madam Guion. To which is added, two letters, covering a life truly Christian; and a discourse upon the universal love and goodness of God to mankind, in and through Jesus Christ. Extracted from two late authors. Phila., Pr. by Francis Bailey, 1789. vi, [3]-181 p. 14.5cm. **Bowe**;DLC;MWA

38 **La Rochefoucauld, François VI**, duc **de**, prince de Marcillac, 1613-1680. Moral reflections and maxims written by the late Duke da la Rochefoucauld. (In **Stanhope, Philip D.** The accomplished gentleman: or, The principles of politeness; extracted from the letters of the late Earl of Chesterfield... To which are added, Moral maxims and reflections, by the late Duke de la Rochefoucauld. Tr. from the French; recommended by the late Earl of Chesterfield. Phila., Pr. by William Spotswood, 1789. p. [45]-88, [4] 16cm.) **Bowe** film fac. **MWA**;MBAt

39 ——— Moral reflections. (In The **new** complete letter writer; or, The art of correspondence... To which are added, Moral maxims and reflections, by the late Duke de la Rochefoucauld... Worcester, Mass., Pr. by Isaiah Thomas, 1791. p. 217-252. 17cm.) **MWA**

40 —— Maxims and moral reflections. By the Duke de la Rochefoucauld. A new ed., rev. and improved. Boston, Pr. by Isaac Larkin, for Ebenezer Larkin, Jun., 1793. xii, 13-141 p. 13cm. **Bowe**

41 —— ——— Boston, Pr. by I. Thomas and E. T. Andrews, 1794. vi, [7]-72 p. 17cm. **Bowe**;DLC;MB;MWA;MeB;NN;RPJCB

42 —— Moral reflections. By the Duke de la Rochefoucauld. (In The **gentleman's** pocket library... Boston, Pr. and sold by W. Spotswood, 1794. p. 91-120. 17cm.) **Bowe**;MWA;CSmH

43 —— Maxims. (In The **new** complete letter writer; or, The art of correspondence... To which are added, Moral maxims and reflections,

by the late Duke de la Rochefoucault[!] ... Boston, Pr. by I. Thomas and E. T. Andrews, 1794. p. [187]-249. 17.5cm.) **Bowe**;MWA

44 —— ——— (In The **new** complete letter writer; or, The art of correspondence... To which are added, Moral maxims and reflections by the late Duke de la Rochefoucault[!] . . . Boston, Pr. by Samuel Etheridge, for Daniel Brewer, April, 1798. p. [179]-225. 17cm.) **Bowe**;MWA

45 [**Fénelon, François de Salignac de la Mothe-**] 1651-1715. Some advice to governesses and teachers. Written by the author of The evidence of the existence of God. Supposed to be translated by Bishop Barclay. Litchfield, Re-pr. by [Thomas] Coll[ier] M,DC[CXC?] [Bates 2625]

Bates item from mutilated t. p. Listed anonymously.
Not in Fisher's bibliography of Collier imprints.

46 [——] Some advice to governesses and teachers. New-Bedford, Pr. by John Spooner, 1795. [Evans 28235; Sabin 86590]

Title from Evans, who lists it under Robert Barclay, the supposed translator. Sabin lists the work anonymously. By Fénelon, author of " Démonstration de l'existence de Dieu."

47 [——] Some advice to governesses and teachers. Written by the author of The evidence of the existence of God. Supposed to be translated by Bishop Barclay. N. Y., Pr. for Daniel Lawrence, by Samuel Campbell, 1795. 8 p. 15.5cm. **NN**

Sabin took his title from a photostat in NN of the t.p. of a copy belonging to Dr. Edward A. West (cf. Sabin 86591). On Oct. 7, 1939 NN was given the West copy, so the N. Y., 1795 ed. described here is the former West copy mentioned by Sabin. Not in Evans.

Attributed to Fénelon (cf. H. & L.). Comparison of the N. Y. 1799 ed. in MH, with a Paris, 1822 ed. of the French *De l'éducation des filles,* shows that the American pamphlet is largely an embodiment of the ideas in Ch. V of the French work, entitled " Instructions indirectes." The American work cannot be called a close translation. The rendition is so free that it must be called an adaptation. This is true unless Fénelon wrote an unseen pamphlet which the American work follows more closely.

49 [——] The adventures of Telemachus, the son of Ulysses. Tr. from the French of the Archbishop of Cambray. A new ed., carefully compared with the original... Boston, Pr. for J. Nancrede, 1797. 2 v. in 1 (i. e. 372 p). front. 18cm. **Bowe**;MWA

T.p. gives " 2 volumes in 1." No second t. p. in the 2 copies seen. Continuous pagination.

50 [——] The adventures of Telemachus, the son of Ulysses. By the Archbishop of Cambray. In French & English. The original care-

fully compared with the best French editions, and rev. and cor. by Joseph Nancrede... Boston, Pr. for Joseph Nancrede, 1797. 2 v. 17cm.
Hatfield(v.1);**NMW**(v.2);BM;MB(v.2)

51 **La Valinière, Pierre Huet de,** 1732-1806. Curious and interesting dialogue, between Mr. Goodwich and Dr. Breviloq, French and English, where every body may find easily the arms for defending his religion and may clear it from all false assertions made against it. By the Reverend Doctor Peter Huet de la Valiniere, who has suffered great persecution for the American cause in the last war, that compelled him to take refuge in the United States. [5 ll. in Latin from the Bible with Eng. trans.] N. Y., Pr. by Thomas Greenleaf, for the author, 1790. 87 p. 17.5cm. **NN**

French t.p. preceding: Dialogue curieux et interessant, entre Mr. Bondesir et le Dr. Breviloq, en français et en anglais, ou l'on peut aisement trouver des armes pour defendre sa religion contre toutes les faussetés inventées contre elle. Par le Reverend Pierre Huet de la Valiniere... [3 ll. in Latin from the Bible with French trans.] N. Y., Imprimé par Tho's Greenleaf, pour l'auteur, 1790.

In French and English on opposite pages.
Parsons item 91, with inadequate title, and no copy located.

52 [**Le Sage, Alain René**] 1668-1747. The comical adventures of Gil Blas of Santillane. And the child of nature, a dramatic novel. Phila., Pr. and sold by William Spotswood, 1790. 166, 68, [4] p. 16cm.
Bowe film fac. **MWA**;BM

Second title: Child of nature. A dramatic piece in four acts. From the French of Madame the Marchioness of Sillery, formerly the Countess of Genlis. Phila., Pr. and sold by Wm. Spotswood, 1790. 68, [4] p.

"Both works have separate signatures, and the latter is sometimes found separate as a complete work." (cf. Evans 22619.)

The above entry is listed in Parsons 88 and Evans 22619, but with no location.

Parsons 88, 142, 158, 473, etc., ascribe to Padre José Francisco Isla various editions of *The Adventures of Gil Blas*. Parsons says of the American editions: "Falsely attributed to Le Sage, because of an edition by the latter in French from Isla's MS. . . . First appeared, Valencia, 1783." Cf. Parsons, item 650; Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque*, 1890-1932, Vol. IV, 672-80.) The ascription to Isla is made on the authority of Sommervogel, who attributed to Isla the title: *Aventuras de Gil Blas de Santillana, robadas à España, adoptadas en Francia, por M. Le Sage, restituidas à su patria y à su lengua nativa por un español zeloso que no sufre se burlen de su nación,* Madrid, 1787-88, 4 v. (cf. Sommervogel, *Dictionnaire,* col. 69.) Most recent works disprove P. Isla's authorship and attribute *Gil Blas* to Le Sage. It is generally agreed that the novel was written in French by Le Sage;

published little by little from 1715 to 1735; and translated into almost all languages. It is so Spanish in form, characters, customs, and episodes, that for a time it was thought, at least in Spain, that it was translated into French from some lost Spanish original. Father Isla, translator and critic of the novel, claimed that a Spanish original had existed, that Le Sage put it into French, pretending he was the author. The Spanish critic Gómez de Baquero refutes Padre Isla, and proves that " la primera materia del *Gil Blas* es española y del siglo XVII; pero la redacción es francesa y muy del siglo XVIII." (Cf. especially *Enciclopedia universal.*) A comparison of the French *Gil Blas* with the Spanish translation by Isla, shows that the Spanish follows the French closely. A comparison of a New York, 1820 edition in 3 vols. in English in NN, with the French and Spanish, shows that the American edition is a close rendition, and that there is nothing to prove that it came from the Spanish (cf. Bowe, " Le Sage's The Adventures of Gil Blas of Santillane," in *The Papers of the Biblio. Soc. of America*, Vol. XXXV, No. 3, 1941, pp. 205-206).

53 [——] The comical adventures of Gil Blas of Santillane. Phila., Pr. and sold by William Spotswood, 1790. 166 p. 15.5cm. **Bowe**

This particular edition or issue not located in Evans or Parsons. Evans 22619 states for the preceding entry that Le Sage's work and that of the Marchioness de Sillery have separate signatures, and are sometimes found separate as complete works. The copy in the Bowe collection is bound in the original boards, and was doubtless issued separately from the edition having the more complete title (see item 52 above). Comparison of the 166 page single work, with the first part of this latter complete work, shows that the pagination, signatures, and setup are the same.

54 —— The history and adventures of Gil Blas de Santillane. From the French of M. Le Sage. Phila., Pr. and sold by W. Woodhouse, at the Bible, No. 6, South Front-Street, 1791. [Evans 23499]

Listed at the end of Campe's *The New Robinson Crusoe*, Phila., 1792, as lately pub. by William Woodhouse.

55 [——] The adventures of Gil Blas, of Santillane, abridged. Worcester, Pr. by Isaiah Thomas, Jun., 1796. 196 p. 12.5cm. **Bowe**;MB;MWA

Parsons 158 and Evans 30686, with no copies located.

56[1] —— Le diable boiteux: or, The devil upon two sticks. Tr. from the French of Monsieur Le Sage, author of The adventures of Gil Blas... Phila., Pr. and sold by Henry Taylor, 1791. 2 v. 16.5cm. **Bowe** film fac. **ViU**

Continuous pagination.

Evans 23497 gives the same title, but with imprint: Phila., Pr. by Henry Taylor, for Robert Campbell, 1791. This latter may be the same ed., or another issue of the same ed., but unlocated.

57[1] —— ——— Phila., Pr. & sold by W. Woodhouse, at the Bible, No. 6, South, Front-Street, 1791. 2 v. [Evans 23498]

58[1] [——] The devil upon two sticks, or The crippled devil. In French and English ... N. Y., Pr. by T. & J. Swords, for J. Rivington, 1795. 2 v. 17cm. **MWA**;PPL

French t.p. preceding: Le diable boiteux. En français et en anglais ... N. Y., Chez J. Rivington, de l'Imprimerie de T. et J. Swords, 1795.

French and English texts on opposite pages.

59[1] [——] The point of honor. A play in three acts. Taken from the French. Phila., 1795. [Evans 29428]

Probable translation of Le Sage's *Le point d'honneur* which was adapted by Le Sage from Francisco de Rojas Zorrilla's *No hay amigo para amigo*. The work is listed in Evans under Rojas Zorrilla, but if the work is an adaptation in French from the Spanish, it is possible to consider Le Sage as the author of the French work. Until a copy of the American edition is located and comparison made with the original, one cannot be sure of the author.

60 [**Fleury, Claude,** l'abbé] 1640-1723. The manners of the ancient Christians. Extracted from a French author, by John Wesley ... Phila., Pr. by Henry Tuckniss, and sold by John Dickens, 1795. 33, [1] p. 18.5cm. **Bowe**;BM;MWA

61 [——] Larger historical catechism, Part I, containing an abridgement of sacred history; Part II, containing the dogmatical points of religion. 1795. xliii, 202 p. 15cm. MdW(lacks t.p.)

This work (Parsons 139) is evidently not an American imprint, for it resembles in title and collation a Newcastle, 1786 ed., and no printing at an American Newcastle is known to exist at this period.

62 **Lhomond, Charles François,** 1727-1794. Selectae e Veteri Testamento, historiae; or Select passages from the Old Testament ... Phila., Pr. by Thomas Dobson, 1795. **PHi**;PU

Collation not given, as the above title is a compilation in the French list from which an analytical is made. It contains Charles Rollins' "Extract from his Method of teaching and studying the belles lettres," p. [iii]-vi. The Rollin extract (also by a Catholic author) is found in other editions of *Selectae e Veteri Testamento,* several editions appearing after 1800.

63 **Millot, Claude François Xavier,** 1726-1785. Elements of general history. Tr. from the French of the Abbé Millot ... 2d American ed. Salem [Mass.] Pr. and sold by Thomas C. Cushing, 1796. 5 v. 22cm. **Bowe**;DLC;M;MB;MBAt;MeB;MH;MSaE;MWA;NB;NjP;NNC

---

[1] Items 56-59 are entered to complete the Le Sage list of American imprints before 1800. Le Sage was probably Catholic, since he had a son who was a priest at Boulogne-sur-Mer. It was here that Le Sage died.

Parsons, item 160, gives only Volume 1 of this 5 volume set.

64 **Rollin, Charles,** 1661-1741. The life of Alexander the Great. King of Macedon. Comp. from ancient history. By Mr. Rollin ... Tr. from the French. Providence, Pr. by B. Wheeler for J. J. Todd, 1796. 257 p. 18cm. **Bowe**;DLC;NNC;MWA;NN;RPJCB

65 **Moreau de Saint Méry, Médéric Louis Élie,** 1750-1819. A general view or abstract of the arts and sciences, adapted to the capacity of youth. Pub. by M. L. E. Moreau de Saint Méry. Tr. from the French by Michael Fortune. [3 ll. of Latin from Cicero] Phila., Pr. by the editor, printer, at the corner of Front and Callow-Hill Street, Oct., 1797. xii, 363, [6] p. 16cm. **NcD**;MWA

66 **Florian, Jean Pierre Claris de,** 1755-1794. Galatea, a pastoral romance; imitated from Cervantes, by M. de Florian. Tr. into English. To which is added, Amelia, or The faithless Briton; Amelia, or Malevolence defeated; and, Miss Seward's Monody on Major Andre... Boston, Pr. and sold by W. Spotswood and C. P. Wayne, 1798. [1], 28,94,61,22 p. plates. 17.5cm.
NN;CtHT;MB;MH;MnU;NPV;PP;PU

Editions of Authors and Works Not Listed in *Early Catholic Americana*

67 **La Chaise, François d'Aix de,** 1624-1709. A letter from Father La Chaise, confessor to the French king, to Father Peters, confessor to the king of England, in which is contained the project and designe of that faction to introduce the Prince of Wales; with some observations on his conception and birth, to which is added a letter from Will Penn to Father La Chaise about the affaires of that babe and the ensueing progress of the Popish designe. Printed in Philadelphia in the Land of Promise by order of Father Penn and to sold by Stephen Lob at the signe of the Apostacy, in Priest-craft lane next door to the Alamode religion [1688?] 15 p. 18.5cm.
Bowe film fac. **NN**

"A letter from Will. Penn to Father La Chaise," dated and signed: Whitehall the 16 day of the fifth month in the year commonly called 1688. Will. Penn. p. 12-15.

Imprint date supplied from dates of the letters.

Evans lists this item in his *American bibliography*, but states that it was probably printed in England. Hildeburn (No. 13) lists the work with his Pennsylvania imprints, but states that the work was really printed in England. He was convinced the typography was not that of the Bradford press. Although the paper and printing would seem to indicate that it was printed in England, yet, with the "Printed in Philadelphia" on the title page, the pamphlet might well be listed in a work dealing with American imprints. If it is fictitious it might be helpful to others to clear it up. If the place of printing is unknown it would be a possible American imprint. Until more is known about the pamphlet it may be accepted as a probable English imprint, but as a possible American one.

The work is a fabrication of Penn's enemies to support the charge that he was a Roman Catholic (cf. Evans).

The French letter attributed to La Chaise is a translation of: Lettre du Pere La Chaise, confesseur du Roy de Rrance; au Pere Peters, confesseur du Roy d'Angleterre; comprenant une félicitation, sur le bon succès qu'il a eu à inventer & faire le jeune Prince de Galles, avec quelques remarques politiques sur l'origine, & naissance d'iceluy . . . [n.p.] 1688 (cf. Bibliothèque Nationale and British Museum). Comparison of samples from the so-called Philadelphia ed. in MH, with the n.p. ed. of the French in the Bibliothèque Nationale, shows that the version in English is a translation. The French letter is apocryphal (cf. Bibliothèque Nationale).

68 **Charlevoix, Pierre François Xavier de,** 1682-1761. An appendix, giving more particular and exact account... [of the French settlements] in Quebec, and its inhabitants with their manner of living, by P. Charlevoix. In An **account** of the French settlements in North America: shewing from the latest authors, the towns, ports, islands, lakes, rivers, &c. of Canada. By a gentleman. To which is added an appendix, giving a more particular and exact account of Quebec, with its inhabitants and their manner of living. By P. Charlevoix. Boston, Pr. and sold by Rogers and Fowle, 1746. p. 20-26. 20.5cm.
Bowe film fac. **MHi**;DLC;MB;MH;MWA;NHi

69 **Sauvages de la Croix, Pierre Augustin Boissier de,** 1710-1795. Directions for the breeding and management of silk-worms. Extracted from the treatises of the Abbé Boissier de Sauvages, and Pullein. With a preface, giving some account of the rise and progress of the scheme for encouraging the culture of silk, in Pennsylvania, and the adjacent colonies. Phila., Pr. by J. Crukshank, and I. Collins, 1770. xv, [1], 32 p. 20.5cm. **DLC**;MB;MH;NHi;NjP

Sauvages de la Croix's treatise translated and epitomized by J. Odell. Pullein's extracts are in the Appendix, p. [21]-32.

70 **Abélard, Pierre,** 1079-1142, and **Héloise,** 1101-1164. Letters of Abelard and Heloise. To which is prefixed a particular account of their lives, amours, and misfortunes. By the late John Hughes, esq. To which is now first added, the poem of Eloisa to Abelard. By Mr. Pope. Phila., Pr. for Samuel Delap, 1775. 124 p. front. 16cm.
Bowe film fac. **MWA**

Contents.—The history of Abelard and Heloise. p. [5]-41.—Letters of Abelard and Heloise. p. [42]-114.—Eloisa to Abelard. By Mr. Pope. p. [115]-124.

71 —— Letters of Abelard and Eloisa. With a particular account of their lives, amours, and misfortunes. By John Hughes, esq. To which are added, several poems. By Mr. Pope, and other authors. Phila., Pr. by Henry Sweitzer, 1796. vi, [1], 219 p. 17cm. **Bowe**;DeWi;MWA;RPJCB

Contents similar to those of the 1775 edition, with different pagings.

72 [**Bordelon, Laurent**] 1653-1730. The management of the tongue... Done out of French. London, Pr.; Boston, Re-pr. and sold by Edes and Sons, in Cornhill, 1783. [15],159 p. 18cm. **Bowe**;MB;MWA;NN;RPJCB

73 [——] ——— New-London, Pr. by Timothy Green, 1786. [Evans 19769]

74 [**Arnauld, Antoine**] 1612-1694, and [**Nicole, Pierre**] 1625-1695, supposed authors. The royal convert: or The force of truth. Being a wonderful and strange relation of the conversion of Varanes, prince of Persia, and two young ladies, to the Christian faith; their trials and sufferings on that account; of the strange death of one of the ladies; and of the prince's success over his enemies, and converting at last his cruel father, and his whole kingdom. Written in French by the Messieurs of Port-Royal, and now newly tr. into English. Boston, Pr. and sold by S. Hall, 1793. iv,[5]-68 p. 17cm. **Bowe**;MB;NN

English translations of some of Arnauld and Nicole's works have on the title page: "Written in French by the Messieurs of Port-Royal." *The royal convert* has not yet been identified.

75 [——] ——— Boston, Pr. and sold by S. Hall, 1794. iv,[5]-68 p. **Bowe**;CSmH;MWA;RPJCB

76 [——] ——— The 1st Exeter ed. Exeter, Pr. and sold by H. Ranlet, 1796. iv,[5]-96 p. 15.5cm. **MWA**

77 [——] ——— Brookfield, Mass., Pr. by E. Merriam & Co., March, 1800. iv,[5]-124 p. 14cm. **DLC**;MWA;NN(t.p. missing)

78 **Ramsay, Andrew Michael**, 1686-1743. The travels of Cyrus. To which is annexed, A discourse upon the theology and mythology of the pagans. By the Chevalier Ramsay. The 10th ed. — 1st American. Burlington [N. J.] Pr. by Isaac Neale, 1793. xx,352 p. 17.5cm. **Bowe**;DLC;MWA;NN;NjP

79 —— ——— Boston, Pr. by Manning & Loring, for S. Hall [etc.] 1795. xvi,[17]-308 p. 18cm. **Bowe**;CSmH;ICJ;MWA;RPJCB

80 —— The travels of Cyrus; to which is annexed, A discourse upon the theology and mythology of the pagans. By M. de Ramsay. Tr. and disposed in the most convenient order for the greater improvement of those who apply themselves to the French and English languages.

By J.E.G.M. de la Grange . . . Phila., Pr. for James Rivington, by Ormrod and Conrad, 1796. 2 v. front. **NNC**;MWA;NN;RPJCB

French t.p. preceding: Les voyages de Cyrus; avec un discours sur la théologie et la mythologie des païens. Par M. de Ramsay. Trad. et mis dans l'ordre le plus convenable, pour hâter les progrès de ceux qui s'appliquent aux langues française et anglaise, par J.E.G.M. de la Grange . . . Phila., Impr. pour James Rivington, chez Ormrod et Conrad, 1796.

Text in French and English on opposite pages.

81 **Fauchet, Claude,** 1744-1793. Eulogium on Benjamin Franklin, L.L.D. &c. Delivered in the Rotunda, on the 21st of July, 1790, in the name of the Commons of Paris; in presence of the deputies to the Legislative Assembly, and of all the departments in the kingdom, the mayor, the commandant-general of the national guards, the representatives of the commons, the presidents of the districts, and the electors of the capital. By the Abbe Fauchet, now constitutional bishop of the department of Calvados, and a member of the National Convention. (In **Franklin, Benjamin.** The works of . . . N. Y., Pr. by Samuel Campbell, 1794. p. [173]-206. 17.5cm.) **Bowe**;MH

82 **France.** Convention Nationale, 1792-1795. Comité d'Instruction Publique . . . Report on the means of compleating[!] and distributing the national library. Made in the name of the Committee of Public Instruction, the 22d Germinal, second year of the Republic. <April 11, 1794.> By Gregoire. <Tr. from an authentic original.> Phila., Pr. and sold at No. 112, Market-Street, 1794. 12 p. 22cm. **DLC**;BM;MWA

Grégoire, Henri Baptiste, constitutional bishop of Blois, 1750-1831.

83 **Le Comte, Louis Daniel,** 1655-1728, and **Du Halde, Jean Baptiste,** 1674-1743. A description of China. By Louis Le Comte, and P. Du Halde. Containing their appointment by the French king;—their adventures till their arrival in China;—their reception at court;—also the buildings, religion, manners and customs of the Chinese, with an account of the climate, vegetables, mines, &c. of that country. (In The **world** displayed; or, A curious collection of voyages and travels . . . Phila., Pub. by Dobelbower, Key, and Simpson, 1795-6. v.6,p.[184]-247. 21.5cm.) **Bowe**;NN;DLC

84 **Godineau,** Citoyen de Bordeaux. Oration upon religious worship, delivered by Citizen Godineau, eldest at the tribune of the National Club of Bordeaux, before the representatives of the people. Tallien and Yzabeau, on the 20th of Nov., 1793. [Phila., Pr. and sold at No. 112, Market-Street] [1798?] 8 p. 20.5cm. **Bowe** film fac. **Hornor**;DLC

Title from caption. Imprint from colophon. Printed by Benj. F. Bache. It is quite possible that Bache, who was printing at 112 Market Street, was the translator of the work. The author and French original have not been identified, though internal evidence indicates that Godineau was a priest (cf. his *Oration,* p. 4).

85 **Lenglet-Dufresnoy, Nicolas,** 1674-1755. Du Fresnoy's geography for youth; or, A short and easy method of teaching and learning geography. Designed principally for the use of schools ... Tr. from the French of Abbé Lenglet du Fresnoy ... 13th ed.... Phila., Pr. for Rice and Co., Market-Street [1798?] vi,[7]-156 (i. e. 164) p. front. (fold. map) 17cm. **Bowe** film fac. **PHi**

II

EARLY CATHOLIC CHURCH PROPERTY IN THE ARCHBISHOP OF MILWAUKEE *

In a discussion regarding abandoned church property it is well to offer a definition. In order to fix attention on abandoned church items the melodramatic description " ghost " churches has been introduced. The first reaction to the word " ghost " is that it refers to a church which is dead. This is true only partially. If the term church is used to mean property or a building and not its people, the word " ghost " implying that it is dead or vanished, is more or less correctly understood. " Ghost " churches therefore refer principally to church edifices which have wholly disappeared, or which are standing unused, though intact, or in ruins, or which have been turned into other buildings or uses, or form parts of other buildings. In most cases in the Milwaukee archdiocese the " ghost " church itself is very much alive because it refers to a church which has migrated or to one which survives in a new form and construction on another location.

Investigation of abandoned church property is more notable perhaps for the unanswered problems it introduces than for its cataloging of pioneer properties which were lost to view or on the verge of disappearing. Some of the problems are connected with allied topics like these: what was the total land endowment by gift made to the church; what was the exact overlapping of parish lines, a question which involves the distribution of churches, population, and unchurched districts; what was the nationality of incoming groups, their regional distribution, together with a study of the language issue; what was the location of the churches in relation to trade areas and roads; what was the size of the congregations; what was the supply of resident and non-resident clergy, or what has been called absentee and migratory pastors; and the study of lay trusteeism in connection with the transfer of property titles.

---

* Paper read at the Twenty-Second Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, December 31, 1941.

The question of reasons for "ghost" churches now comes to the fore. The main one includes an unsuitable location. In pioneer days due to personal interest or to unpredictable routing of roads or to uncertainty about the area to be settled, or to lack of information about actual and changing settlements, churches were hastily assembled. After a time when roads were charted and commenced, when trade centers of incoming settlers were determined and when the land was taken up, churches off the main arteries and away from the hubs of settlement were doomed. They had to be moved, abandoned, sold, or dismantled. Naturally only a few of the stone structures survived as intact monuments. Most of the early churches being of logs or boards were moved or dismantled and then converted into other buildings.

Though demanded by majority interest and ecclesiastical order, changes were not always effected without schism, and at times they were accompanied by apostacy. When personal initiative and interest dictated the location of early churches, at times it was reluctant to deliver the deed to the property to the church. This is the chief manifestation of lay trusteeism which has appeared in the local church history.

Migration of settlers closed churches. Among the causes for migration may be mentioned: the gold rush of the middle of the last century; Catholics often came after the better land was taken and gave up their holdings after an unequal struggle on poor land; at times Catholics migrated from the land either because they were not trained for agricultural work or were unwilling to adapt themselves to the added chores related to a combination of grain and cattle; many a settler had to leave the land because of the lack of a primogeniture succession. The democratic insistence on a division of property drove everyone off the land. Children, including the eldest son, had no economic future on the soil and soon deserted their parents. Another reason for the shift of population, involving the abandonment of churches, was the incompatibility of various nationalities. A group of one nationality lost in a sea of other nationals was sure to move out. Other reasons which brought about changes in the location of churches are fire and liquor. The accident of fire sometimes proved decisive in facilitating a change. Proximity of churches to taverns is a cause for removal in some cases.

In the archdiocese of Milwaukee, which covers seventeen counties in southeastern Wisconsin, there are some seventy-seven churches of yesterday. Two alone escaped fixation on a site. Indeed there are a few churches named and represented as existent, which never saw the light of day.

Besides describing property by linear drawings, the investigation attempted to spot the exact locations in the township sections and to give chronological details. A by-product of the study is a list of changes in church names. One reason for this was the presence of factions which included preferences for special names.

Cemeteries in connection with "ghost" churches were included in the survey. Inscriptions, bas-reliefs, and sculpture therein may form the basis for a review of religion, culture, and demography. Some day students will answer the questions: Are the inscriptions sentimental or doctrinal? Are the bas-reliefs artistic? What is the catalogue of symbols used? Where did the people of yesterday come from? Where are the names of long ago?

Not the least of the studies opened up by the "ghost" churches refers to Temperance Halls. These are "ghosts" too. Besides their ostensible aim, indicated by their name, these halls had social and cultural objectives. They were the headquarters for literary and debating societies. In them was housed a library for the benefit and use of members. Historians may find in the halls the first step of members towards the professions. The halls are a sharp reminder that the rural economics of the time did not overshadow other interests. Search so far has failed to discover any minutes of societies which used the halls.

An effort was made to find the nicknames of various places. Popular names are some indication of humor, good nature, of local physical and moral problems, and of the ageless sport of calling names. The name, Vielnoethig, is a brief footnote in the history of a people's hard-bitten humor and of local hard times. Other significant terms are: Katzenbuckel, Pestilenzbuckel, Kaetzeberg, Hunsrueck, Schnappsburg, Saufburg, Teufelseck, Gaensburg, Froeschloch, Halunkenburg, Schollenklopper and Blutgericht. The best known and oftenest used name seems to be Whiskey Corners. It is not devoid of considerable historical meaning.

The investigation of "ghost" churches definitely stimulated a genuine interest in the soil and people. Knowledge of geography should begin with the local section, township, and county. Knowledge of a section of land with all its tie-ups is a sure beginning of a genuine interest in the soil on which people settled and from which they drew nourishment and living. Young folks may be attracted to the land again when they realize that it not only is a gold mine but also a satisfactory place upon which to live. For instance, how intriguing section sixteen, the school endowment in every township, becomes, when people know that it is the substitute for the free monastic schools which were wiped out by the English break with Rome!

"Ghost" churches introduce the student to the immigrant. Where did the settlers come from? What were their nationalistic traits? What contribution did they make towards clearing the land and promoting thriving towns? How adaptable were they to the needs of diversified farming? Where did the newcomers settle? What role did the main roads play in the locating of churches? The foregoing are some of the questions opened up for solution by the study of early churches.

While no attempt was made to gather relics, this would have been easy. Efforts to discover a reported manuscript missal, however, were unsuccessful. Sites of the first Catholic services, which were usually held in settlers' homes, are pretty well established. The *Catholic Almanac* reports these as settlements, adding the name of the settler, who happened to play host to the visiting priest.

A word may be said about sources and the technique used in the investigation. County registries of deeds are essential and often proved to be a decisive factor in locating church land. Use of these records is facilitated if the section in which the property is located is known, together with the date and names of interested parties. Because of the various methods employed for entering deeds and indexing them, there is a great diversity in the research work. In case county records become lost or destroyed recourse must be had to abstract companies or individuals.

The *Catholic Almanac* and its successor, the *Catholic Directory*, are indispensable. Newspapers offer great aid, particularly for fixing dates. Maps, old and new, particularly of townships, form an essential instrument. Chancery archives should be visited for pertinent material.

Oral tradition plays its part in the search for early churches. Interviews with early settlers or their descendants are often decisive in fixing church dimensions when all traces of these have disappeared. Besides, tradition is a guide to properties when no transfer of title took place.

A few items related to technique may be mentioned. Scanning titles to property and spotting properties afield demand some knowledge of the legal angles of real estate, deeds, and their interpretation. Besides, skill in drawing and other details for blue-printing are helpful. In the investigation a good deal of the foregoing work was done by an architect, builder, and realtor.

Most of the method pursued is familiar to research workers in history. In cases where most of the literary and oral traces are lacking, the work may take on the proportions of a field expedition. First of all, forgotten cemeteries must be discovered. To attack them adequately, and indeed some church sites, suitable clothing and tools, like shovels, axes and ropes, are advisable. A field explorer must be prepared to search for foundations, to overturn stone slabs, to rake for broken window glass and plaster. Needless to say a camera is a handy guarantee for recording all kinds of finds.

The work described in the foregoing sketch has been privately published in book form La Vies, John G.: and Peter Leo Johnson, *Location and Detailed Description of Early Catholic Church Property in the Archdiocese of Milwaukee* (Milwaukee: Limited complimentary edition, distributed from the Chancery Office of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee. 1941. Pp. 6, 83). It is printed from photostatic plates and features linear drawings of the ground plans and areas of early church properties in the Milwaukee archdiocese. Included besides are the registered deeds, chronological details, and some membership lists. There are also a number of maps of the archdiocese.

PETER LEO JOHNSON

St. Francis Seminary

BOOK REVIEWS

AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY

In No Strange Land. Some American Catholic Converts. By KATHERINE BURTON. (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1942. Pp. xix, 254. $2.50.)

"In this book have been gathered together the brief biographies of some of the more outstanding American converts to the Catholic faith during the nineteenth century, although a few of them belong to our twentieth. . . . In one way or another, each of the converts mentioned here was attracted to the Catholic Church by the consideration of its continuity. . . . There are many other important American converts to Catholicism not mentioned in this book. . . . But the people written about here fall into the group affected in one way or another by the American tradition of culture and of democracy."

Thus Katherine Burton introduces her fifteen sketches of converts to the Catholic faith, who by their conversion found themselves *In No Strange Land.* "In a time when Catholicism was looked on as a foreign sect, they saw what it really was: the universal Church of mankind, not of Italy but of the world." These converts include the former Protestant Episcopal Bishop of North Carolina, Levi Silliman Ives; Sarah Worthington King Peter, who did much for religious life in Cincinnati; Sophia Dana Ripley, whose conversion was brought about by the influence of Father Hecker; the famous Orestes A. Brownson of the Concord School; Cornelia Peacock Connolly, foundress of the Society of the Holy Child Jesus; the Paulist Group, principally their founder, Father Isaac Thomas Hecker; James Kent Stone, later the Passionist Father Fidelis of the Cross; Ira Dutton, who is known as Brother Dutton of Molokai; the poet-priest, John Bannister Tabb; Lucy Smith, later Mother Catherine de Ricci, foundress of the Dominican Nuns of St. Catherine de Ricci; Rose Hawthorne Lathrop, foundress of the Servants of Relief for Incurable Cancer; Lewis Thomas Wattson, founder of the Society of the Atonement as Father Paul James Francis; Marion Gurney, who became Mother Marianne of Jesus as foundress of the Sisters of Our Lady of Christian Doctrine; Wilmoth Alexander Farmer, a missionary in China known as Father Francis X. Farmer, S. J.; and the erstwhile rector of the Episcopal Church of St. Mary in New York City, Selden Peabody Delany.

The author has made a happy selection to fit the underlying idea expressed in her introduction. By her own conversion she is well fitted to understand the workings of grace in these souls. She was well prepared to write these sketches by her previous experience in writing the life of Rose Hawthorne Lathrop in *Sorrow Built A Bridge* and of Elizabeth Ann Seton in *His Dear Persuasion,* as well as in penning the story of Brook Farm in *Paradise Planters*. She feels especially at home in searching out the mind of the so-called Concord School.

While these studies are not in general the result of original research, as indicated in the short bibliography, the author's clear thinking and her grasp of prominent traits make the sketches not only pleasant reading, but also useful commentaries on the ways of converts. Such popularization can do only good to the Catholic reading public, and possibly to those who are groping along the thorny path that leads to the Church. Unfortunately there is no index.

THEODORE ROEMER

St. Lawrence College
Mount Calvary, Wisconsin

From Desenzano to "The Pines". By MOTHER M. ST. PAUL, O.S.U. (Toronto: Macmillan Co., Ltd. 1941. Pp. xvi, 387. $4.00.)

Mother M. St. Paul provides a beautiful historical setting for her history of the Ursuline foundation of Chatham, Ontario, of which she is a member, by finding its origin in St. Angela's country home of Desenzano, Italy and then coming down through the centuries, marking them with the eventful history of the Company of St. Ursula.

The introductory chapter, which is biographical of Angela Merici, is followed by chapters on the organization of the Institute, its development in Italy, and the foundations in France where the precarious years of the French Revolution threatened to wreck the Institute there until peace came again to the land of the *fleur-de-lis*. The foundress of this Canadian Motherhouse, Mother Mary Xavier, was a professed religious in the convent of Le Faouët when she responded to the far-away call of the Jesuit Fathers at Sault Ste. Marie, whence they had returned after a prolonged absence. Because of many complications that prevented possible companions from accompanying her, Mother Mary Xavier made the hazardous crossing alone in 1853. From New York she traveled by way of Detroit, where she had the opportunity of an interview with Bishop Peter Lefèvre in whose diocese she expected to make her foundation. May 25, 1853 the Mother Foundress reached the Sault, nearly three months after leaving her convent home in Brittany. She opened a school at once and was soon joined by zealous young recruits who aided her in the founding of another convent of St. Ursula.

In her pioneer experiences on the American frontier, Mother Mary Xavier was following precedents set by other valiant Ursulines of the past, i e., Mère Marie de l'Incarnation who made the foundation in Quebec, Mère Marie Saint-Augustin Tranchepain in New Orleans, Mother Julia Chatfield on the Ohio frontier, and in another generation, Mother Amadeus who manifested the same leadership in the Indian missions of Montana and even ventured into the frozen northern field of the Alaskan Eskimo. Providential circumstances caused Mother Mary Xavier to experience her successes in Chatham, Ontario, rather than the States. From the " Pines ", as the Chatham foundation is affectionately designated, parochial schools have been taken over in different Canadian provinces and in the United States when opportunities were offered. The Ursuline College, Brescia Hall, London, Ontario, situated opposite the campus of the University of Western Ontario, is the most notable achievement of the Chatham community.

Mother M. St. Paul's style is stimulating and inspiring, and her work of inestimable worth to her own community, a contribution to religious literature and to church history. Her history, however, is not a model for historical works on religious congregations, but especially appropriate for the Chatham foundation of Ursulines.

Sister M. Doris

Rosary College

The History of St. Thomas Parish, Ann Arbor. By Louis W. Doll. (Ann Arbor: Ann Arbor Press. 1941. Pp. vi, 291. $2.50.)

The volume under review is a refreshing contrast to the mine run of parish histories. It is refined and dignified in its format and typography, and its substance is a valuable addition to the growing list of first-rate Catholic historical monographs. Written by a scholarly layman who holds his doctorate in mediaeval history from the University of Michigan, the book evinces the qualities that might be expected from such authorship. The copious notes at the end of each chapter testify to the diligent care with which the writer has winnowed all available source material including archival deposits both Catholic and secular, and the dusty files of long defunct newspapers.

St. Thomas was the second English-speaking parish in the archdiocese of Detroit, and since at the period of its founding this meant that it was a parish of Irishmen, the author properly introduces his story with a brief sketch of Irish immigration to the United States. The history of the parish begins in 1835, when the Reverend Patrick O'Kelly, who had come to Detroit in 1829 from the missions of western New York, made Ann Arbor the center of his ministrations to the settlers in Washtenaw and adjoining counties. He was succeeded in 1840 by Father Thomas Cullen, and the book in hand is a record of development and progress through a hundred years from humble beginnings to a thoroughly organized and equipped parish that holds an eminent position in the archdiocese.

Ten pastorates span the century from Father Cullen to the present incumbent, and the author uses them as chapter divisions for his narrative. This arrangement implies the throwing together of much unrelated material, and there has appeared as yet no Parkman of parish histories to show us how to make fine writing out of the multitudinous details that are sure to weary the general reader, but which are eagerly sought for by those for whom such a book is primarily written. Yet, the author weaves his material together fairly well, and if there are tedious pages there are also bright spots like the naming of the church at Northfield, where the Irish and German factions settled the matter by throwing dollars into barrels labeled St. Patrick and St. Joseph. There was some doubt about the vote of a German married to an Irishwoman; but willy nilly he was marched to St. Patrick's barrel, and St. Patrick's it is to this day.

The history of the parish proper is followed by a rather unusual feature, a forty-three page account of athletic activities. Then come several appendices containing documentary material and details from the parish registers. The volume ends with a bibliography and an adequate index. Remarkably free from blemishes, the book has an occasional misspelling of a proper name, and one or two references to matters outside the author's field where only a specialist could have been accurate.

George W. Paré

Sacred Heart Rectory
Grosse Ile, Michigan

MEDIAEVAL HISTORY

Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books. Edited by N. R. Ker, Lecturer in Palaeography at Oxford University. [Royal Historical Society, Guides and Handbooks. No. 3.] (London: Royal Historical Society. 1941. Pp. xxiv, 169. 7/6.)

This rather slender volume is a most welcome addition to the tools for the study of books in mediaeval England and Scotland. It is a catalog of surviving manuscripts which can today be identified as having belonged to one of the religious houses, cathedrals, or colleges of the Middle Ages. However, there is an important and, in the reviewer's opinion, most unfortunate exception in the inclusiveness of the volume: "Books belonging to the medieval libraries of the cathedral churches of Durham, Hereford, Lincoln, Salisbury and Worcester, of Cambridge University, of the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, of Eton College and of Winchester College are not included, if they still remain in the modern libraries at those places"; (that is, only the strays are mentioned in the book before us).

Every scholar would be delighted to possess the fine series of catalogs of these libraries (many of them being the work of M. R. James); but, at least on this side of the ocean, few will be so fortunate as to have them all at hand, and the omission of these collections will greatly limit the independent value of the present volume.

The main body of the work is an alphabetical list of mediaeval libraries, under each of which is given its surviving manuscripts and their present location. It is thus a link between the original mediaeval book-lists and catalogs of modern collections. The material has been drawn primarily from these catalogs of modern libraries, and the editor warns us that it is not intended to be used by itself, but together with them, as a key for cross-reference. But unless quite recent, these modern catalogs are likely to be deficient in their information regarding provenance; so when possible, and in a larger measure than the introduction modestly claims, this has been supplemented with recent literature, and with the painstaking examination of many manuscripts by the editor and his associates. In this way the present volume makes corrections and adds new identifications to the information already available in print. Approximately 4200 books are listed, coming from about 500 mediaeval libraries; and we are reminded again of the accidents of survival across the sixteenth century revolution and into modern times. More than 400 of the libraries, some of them of important monasteries, are represented by not more than ten volumes each. The cathedral priory of Durham was the most fortunate, with 500 manuscripts known to be still existing today, the majority still in their old home.

The chief aim of this handbook is, of course, to be a help to further studies among the manuscripts themselves. But it will also give some idea of the contents of many old libraries for which no mediaeval catalogs have survived. And while allowance must be made for the fact that the manuscripts still remaining are fortuitous survivals from the original collections, still from so large a number we can gain some helpful views of the writings available to the clergy of abbey and college in the later Middle Ages.

CARLETON M. SAGE

Catholic University of America

The Crusade of Richard Lion-Heart by Ambroise. Translated by MERTON JEROME HUBERT with Notes and Documentation by JOHN L. LA MONTE. [Records of Civilization, Volume XXXIV.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 1941. Pp. xi, 478. $4.00.)

Ever since Gaston Paris published in 1897 a critical edition of the old French poem of Ambroise relating the story of King Richard's crusade, scholarly controversy has raged as to its origin and its relation to the

Latin chronicle known as the *Itinerarium regis Ricardi.* That the poem and the *Itinerarium* closely resembled each other was immediately obvious. Indeed, Gaston Paris concluded that Richard of the Holy Trinity, the author of the *Itinerarium,* simply produced a Latin prose version of Ambroise's poem. Kate Norgate, on the other hand, held that Ambroise transformed Richard's rough notes into old French poetry. The present editors agree with J. G. Edwards that both Ambroise and Richard reworked an earlier original source, since lost, and convincingly marshal further evidence to support this contention. Their work, therefore, constitutes not merely a translation but a critical edition of what is undoubtedly the best account of King Richard's crusade. Moreover, the two collaborators bring to their task a happy combination of talents. Professor Hubert's knowledge of Romance language and literature enables him to see the significance of Ambroise's poem as "occupying a transitional position between the fiction of the heroic *chansons de geste* and the prose narratives of men such as Villehardouin and Joinville." And he has preserved something of the flavor of the original by an ingenious use of metrical rhymed couplets. Professor La Monte's wide experience with the sources of the crusades and his understanding of the historical background is evident in the critical apparatus.

Ambroise (or the original author whose work he used) was a representative of the rank and file of the crusading army. He told what he saw with an engaging simplicity and occasionally a real vividness. He was a partisan of King Richard, his hero, and hence had little sympathy with the diplomatic and military conservatism of the Syrian Franks. In short, he viewed the stirring events of the Third Crusade from the standpoint of the truly zealous crusader. His was that naive spirit which, despite the powerful influence of material motives, underlay the whole crusade, a spirit well exemplified in the following lines (83-86):

> So these, while they have died in flesh
> In paradise now live afresh.
> And so live all who meet their end
> O'erseas, their Lord God to defend.

In addition to introduction, notes, bibliography, tables and index, this attractively printed volume contains a number of illustrations, chapter headpieces, and two maps.

MARSHALL W. BALDWIN

New York University

Medieval Humanism. By GERALD GROVELAND WALSH, S.J. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1942. Pp. ix, 103. $1.00.)

Father Walsh describes mediaeval humanism "as a synthesis of the fivefold striving after happiness represented by Hellenic intelligence, Roman conscience, Christian Grace, Celtic fancy and Teutonic feeling" (p. 11). The process of the blending of these elements is summarized in the first two chapters of this addition to the Christendom Series. Chapters three and four sketch the story of the humanistic tradition from the Carolingian revirescence through the twelfth and thirteenth centuries to Dante. The chief contributing factors in the growth of this tradition are evaluated: the Anglo-Saxon revival, which is discussed after the Carolingian revirescence, the Normans, the monastic teachers, the universities and scholasticism. In St. Thomas Aquinas and Dante mediaeval humanism arrived at its zenith. St. Thomas' *Summa* is, however, too difficult a book for the average reader. He will find the key to the understanding of mediaeval humanism in Dante's *Divine Comedy*. The author devotes fifteen pages to the proof of Dante's right to the title of integral humanist.

Father Walsh was forced to make a short story of what is in reality a long one. He fully realizes that the totality of mediaeval humanistic achievement is to be sought in "the rich reality of medieval life" (p. vii). Even the story of the humanistic tradition to which he limits himself is varied and complex. He has, nevertheless, succeeded in highlighting the contributions of the intellectual leaders of more than a millennium of Christian thought. His generalizations are usually apt—at times, even brilliant. The pressure for brevity has, however, led him at times into statements that are at best ambiguous. To illustrate: St. Paul converting the Athenians, Catholic bishops from Britain at the Council of Nice, the terrible Theodosius the Great, the placid Normans, the tenth century the darkest of the "Dark Ages", far-away tenth century Saxony, the monastic scriptorium became an active institution in the twelfth century, 10,000 students at Paris, a large percentage of the popes and statesmen of the Middle Ages were men of lowly parentage, St. Albert the Great and St. Thomas at the University of Cologne, mistaken and misdirected mysticism of the late Middle Ages. Some readers will also expect more regularity and exactness in noting the source of quotations; others will find the neglect to translate some of the Latin and Italian quotations a hindrance to the understanding of the text. At least one reader is certain that Monte Casino no longer boasts of Peter the Deacon. The work of C. H. Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 1927), is hardly a "summary of the many works that have appeared in the last twenty-five years" (p. 63).

These blemishes, real or apparent, in no way shake the conviction of this reviewer that Father Walsh has a grasp of the content of the Christian humanistic tradition. Because of the lack of a "completely satisfactory account in English of the nature and historical development of medieval humanism" (p. 97) he hopes that Father Walsh will find the time to give us just that.

St. Benedict's College VICTOR GELLHAUS

MODERN HISTORY

Admiral of the Ocean Sea: A Life of Christopher Columbus. By SAMUEL ELIOT MORISON. Maps by Erwin Raisz. Drawings by Bertram Greene. Two Volumes. (Boston: Little, Brown and Co. 1942. Pp. xlv, 448; viii, 445. $10.00.)

One wishes that he could read through this work in a single sitting, especially after mastering an introductory chapter on navigation and nautical terms in Columbus' time. So instructed, the discoverer's voyages take on a new and lively interest even though one has read the narratives of his exploits and those of others. It is not necessary to heed the warnings which the author feels he should give his readers that there lie ahead reefs and breakers, pages of technical detail. What is more, he writes in everyday language. This is "phoney" and that "sticks in one's crop." Shades of John Harvard that the distinguished historian of the college he founded should "get the hang" of such expressions!

Professor Morison, however, has done more than produce a thrilling and scientific account of Columbus' career in popular language. Myths that have gathered about him, in particular about his efforts to get assistance, are effectively disposed of as "moonshine:" for example, the learned clerics on the faculty of the University of Salamanca, men long pictured as narrow-minded pedants steeped in the lore of a bible-belt scholasticism, no longer confront the discoverer with faces pompously scowled to indicate their superior assurance that the world is flat. As a matter of fact the university divines were not commissioned to investigate and weigh Columbus' theories and so did not enter his life. If they had, the scholastics would have known, as did others of their day and long before, that the world is not flat. This refutation, among many others, bespeaks familiarity with pre-Columbian sources and knowledge of their times.

Yet there stick to the chick bits of the old shell. Writes the author: "in his faith, his deductive methods of reasoning, his unquestioning acceptance of the current ethics, Columbus was a man of the Middle Ages, and in the best sense. In his readiness to translate thought into action, in lively curiosity and accurate observation of natural phenomena, in his joyous sense of adventure and desire to win wealth and recognition, he was a modern man" (I, 6). The mediaeval characteristics of Columbus belong to many modern men quite as much as his modern characteristics are exemplified in the lives and deeds of many mediaeval men. The discoverer, it will be recalled, was born and reared in North Italian Genoa. Again, is it true that "so great was the veneration for the ancients" in Columbus' time "that if any discovery conflicted with Ptolemy, so much the worse for the discoverer" (I, 46). In the Middle Ages the ancients had been questioned even by the alchemists and astrologers. On second thought, we note that Columbus lived well within the period of the "Renaissance." And what is there "strange and pathetic" about Columbus, "Admiral of the Ocean Sea, discoverer of the Indies and (as he thought) of Cathay, founder of the first European colony in the New World, living quietly and unobtrusively, garbed like an humble friar . . ." (II, 222). But these passages are of so little moment that they are worth noting only to temper what might otherwise be regarded as an extravagantly laudatory review.

Some words must be added in commendation of the Book-of-the-Month Club which elected to distribute Professor Morison's work in a one-volume edition without its critical and supporting apparatus. Considering the welter of pseudo-historical productions which is forever bombarding people of cultural interests, the club has done both the public and scholarship a great service by giving wide circulation to so sound and literate a piece of historical workmanship.

FRANCIS J. TSCHAN

Pennsylvania State College

Essays on Antisemitism. Edited by KOPPEL S. PINSON, Assistant Professor of History in Queens College. [Jewish Social Studies. No. 2.] (New York: Conference on Jewish Relations. 1942. Pp. xii, 202. $2.00.)

These essays are the outgrowth of a symposium on antisemitism arranged by the Conference on Jewish Relations in 1935. The volume contains seven historical and four analytical essays by eleven distinguished Jewish scholars, American and European. The reader is given, therefore, in this collection of excellent studies the considered judgments of some of the best Jewish minds on this most tragic question.

The historians and analysts bring up and illustrate abundantly all the traditional causes of antisemitism: religious, social, political, economic, cultural, and racial, but disagree as to the relative importance of each cause or combination of causes in different places and in different times. Several, however, tend to lay great stress on the economic motives of antisemitism. Dr. Weinryb, for example, shows clearly that anti-semitism in Central Europe where the Jews formed such important minority groups, increased or declined in proportion to the prosperity and economic opportunities of the time.

Of more interest and importance than a review of the still disputed question of causes are the ways proposed for curing this social disease. Professor Ralph Marcus believes "the only solution" lies in an international federation of states in which social and economic justice prevails and in which the state will educate the young to see the benefit of a religious and cultural diversity within the framework of a democratic society. Dr. Wechsler feels that it is " quite possible that a change in the economic order and the bridling of religious forces or the removal of the emphasis upon intense nationalism may weaken and ultimately eliminate antisemitism ". For Professor Jacob Marcus " the only hope of the Jews lies in an appeal to the masses whose rationality and educability we must assume." He believes that good will movements between Jews and Christians are of real help and suggests that a joint committee of Christians and Jews undertake to examine all Protestant and Catholic religious textbooks for traces of antisemitism and recommend a frank and sympathetic treatment of the Jewish problem in them so that youth will come of age with an understanding of the Jew and his problem. For the late Professor Diesendruck, antisemitism is a specimen of pure hate and is without cure: " Every attempt to fight an irrational phenomenon by rational means, mistaking symptoms for causes, is not only futile but also harmful; it leads to that clash with the stone wall, the shock of disillusionment and all the resulting and lasting consequences." None of the authors is overoptimistic about Palestine.

As one might well expect in a study of antisemitism, the Christians do not escape censure for their past and present record. While admitting the justice of this, the Christian will at times find himself in disagreement with certain interpretations of the past. The essay by Solomon Grayzel, in particular, on Christian-Jewish relations in the first millenium is one that must find the Christian at times in disagreement with the author. It is a disagreement more than 1900 years old.

JAMES A. CORBETT

University of Notre Dame

Napoleon's Invasion of Russia—1812. By EUGENE TARLÉ. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1942. Pp. 422. $3.50.)

It goes without saying that this is a timely book. But like most timely books, it is far from being an adequate study of its subject. The chief criticism to be made against it could be summed up in the words that, while almost exclusively concerned with military history, most facts of military importance have been omitted. For example, there is nowhere any discussion of the organization of the invading forces. In Chapter I we are promised: " The next chapter will deal with the composition and peculiar character of this army " (p. 51). But this promise is never fulfilled. As a result it is almost impossible to follow the army on its march. We are told that Davout was at Orsha, or Ney moved southeast, but these statements are almost meaningless since the reader has never been told what forces were subject to these men. The guerrilla warfare against the Grand Army can only be understood if the disposition of that army on the march is known.

This failure to describe either the terrain or the disposition of forces becomes acute when Professor Tarlé tries to describe a battle. At Borodino the reader is left completely in the dark as to the situation of the various French corps or the relative positions of the points mentioned (the Koloch " River ", Semenovsky, or Borodino itself.) As a result this account has the qualities of a cinema scenario—long-range views of a bloody chaos interspersed with close-ups of incredible courage and gallantry (the orderly Bibilov losing an arm or General Bagration dying on a hill side). But like most cinema battles, the historian hardly recognizes it.

The impressionism of Tarlé's account fails to do justice to the great retreat. There again the scenario-technique gives one the idea that the French were fleeing like a flock of sheep. In fact, during the greater part of this retreat the Napoleonic forces were organized in a rational fashion and the duties of the various corps regularly rotated. One of the great dramas of the retreat is the effort of the French officers to maintain this discipline as well as the soldiers' morale. Tarlé says nothing of either problem.

As a final example of the inadequacy of this work we might examine the answer which is given to the obvious question: why were they fighting? Almost nothing is said of the Russian motives. The French motives are described as those of capitalistic imperialism. Certainly Tarlé, who is one of the world's authorities on the economic history of the Napoleonic period, must see the anachronism of applying the Leninist interpretation of imperialism to the last outburst of mercantilism. To prove his contention that the Napoleonic empire was imperialist, Tarlé states that licenses to import from England were granted to French merchants but were withheld from the merchants of conquered countries (p. 406). In at least two other works the author has described how these licenses were issued to the merchants of subject countries " au même titre que les bénéficiaires français " (*Le Blocus continental et le Royaume d'Italie*, p. 206). Consequently the reviewer feels that this book can be explained in one of two fashions. Either it was not written by Tarlé or it is a hastily written pot-boiler. The former possibility is eliminated by the fact that the style is typical of Tarlé.

CARROLL QUIGLEY

Georgetown University

A Generation of Materialism, 1871-1900. By CARLETON J. H. HAYES. (New York and London: Harper and Bros. 1941. Pp. xxi, 390. $3.75.)

This work is Volume XVII in the *Rise of Modern Europe* edited by Professor Langer, and it follows the general plan of the series—to write broad accounts of the "larger forces common to the whole of European civilization", rather than narrow national histories. Professor Carleton J. H. Hayes in *A Generation of Materialism* does a brilliant piece of historical synthesis in presenting a picture of the political, social, economic, and intellectual life of Europe from 1871 to 1900.

This was an age of "isms"—liberalism, nationalism, imperialism, racialism, anti-clericalism, Marxian socialism, industrialism, "evolutionism", modernism, surrealism—and, underlying them all, the basic philosophy of materialism. Professor Hayes painstakingly fits each piece into an arresting mosaic. Not the least satisfying feature of the volume is the freshness of viewpoint; for its author is not shackled by the fetters that bind so many historians to slavish, uncritical worship of such shibboleths as "liberalism", "nationalism", and "Darwinism".

The pre-1870 brand of liberalism is characterized as "ecumenical liberalism" which aimed to be "all things to all men", sheltering under its broad canopy atheists and Christians, industrial capitalists and Marxian socialists, and uniting them all only in "a basic regard for the individual and for safeguarding his liberty against despotic authority." After 1870 came "sectarian Liberalism" (with the capital letter), dogmatic, doctrinaire, anathematizing all "fellow-travelers" who refused to accept its own narrow interpretation of the word "liberal". These "sectarian Liberals" whose creed Professor Hayes sums up as

> ...a solicitude for personal liberty, especially for freedom of the press, an almost religious devotion to science and secular schooling; a robust anticlericalism; a curious kind of nationalism; and a sublime confidence in the rich blessings of material prosperity to be attained through parliamentary government and the strict practice of economic liberalism

came to consider themselves the only "liberals", and finally caused the halo with which men had invested that term to dissolve.

Liberalism is only one of the pieces in the mosaic. The pervasive influence of mechanistic science and deterministic evolutionary biology; the impact of materialistic philosophy on religion and the arts; trade unionism and Marxian socialism; economic nationalism and the revival of over-seas imperialism, with the resultant weakening of "sectarian Liberalism"—all receive due attention, in a gently ironic style that is highly engaging. One might mention as special examples of this felicitous literary style, Professor Hayes' dissection of the sociological and psychological realists in literature; the treatment of the "theology" of Marxian socialism; and the analysis of the impact of "ismism" on the Catholic Church in the pontificate of Leo XIII. Unlike many other historians of our generation, Professor Hayes does not worship at the shrine of exponents of *Realpolitik*, like Bismarck, who, through unifications achieved by force, really wrecked the dream of a federated Europe held in the 1860's, and replaced it with an atomized Europe, politically and economically disjoined, and espousing a policy of rabid, anti-European nationalism.

For it was the Generation of Materialism, not our own generation, that was, in the phrase of Professor Hayes, "the seed-time of totalitarian nationalism." Ironically enough, the theory of the inheritance of acquired characteristics, set forth by Darwin, now universally rejected by biologists, formed the basis of the vicious racialism and antisemitism of Gobineau, Richard Wagner, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, who were the forerunners of today's Aryan cult. Such variegated hierophants as Treitschke and Adolf Stocker, Déroulède and Barrès, Danilevski and D'Annunzio planted the seeds of racialism and totalitarian nationalism; and Nietzsche's "philosophy of the will" and contempt of pity watered the soil and prepared the noxious floriations of our own day. More logical than some other historians, Professor Hayes sees that one cannot idealize those men who planted totalitarianism in the Generation of Materialism and then recoil from its brutal and naked present manifestations.

No review of *A Generation of Materialism* ought to omit a tribute to the extraordinarily competent Essay on Bibliography, a masterpiece of its kind, or to the deftly chosen illustrations (which form a separate section of the volume), ranging all the way from *Punch* to Gauguin, from the Moulin Rouge to the White Fathers of Cardinal Lavigerie in Africa. This book marks the apogee of Professor Hayes' scholarship. It is shining proof that historical craftmanship can be literary without being unscientific, objective without being dull.

FRANCIS A. ARLINGHAUS

University of Detroit

The German Elections of 1907. By GEORGE DUNLAP CROTHERS. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1941. Pp. vii, 277. $3.00.)

This study of the German elections of 1907 is primarily concerned with the changes in German public opinion in regard to certain "national" questions and policies. Dr. Crothers has made an excellent analysis from a vast and scattered literature in newspapers, pamphlets, and recorded speeches. Other sources which would have been pertinent to this study were unavailable and party records and private papers which would have been helpful have been destroyed. The author had the advantage of interviewing several members of the Reichstag who had taken an active part in the political battles under consideration. The elections of 1907 are viewed as the last of a series of major events which produced a gradual change in the German national spirit before the First World War. They marked the end of all significant opposition to such nationalistic policies as military, naval, and colonial expansion.

A target in the elections was the Catholic Center Party, which was considered as " nationally unreliable ", although it had supported national bills since 1893. It was, however, never blindly nationalistic. The party was charged with being ultramontane, of taking orders from the pope, of lacking enthusiasm for a strong central government. The antagonism to the Center Party had come to a head over the colonial question. The Catholic Party was anxious to achieve a reduction in the number of troops in Southwest Africa and was insisting upon economy and reforms. The dissolution of the Reichstag in December, 1906 came about largely as a result of the Center's criticism of the colonial administration and its refusal to support Bülow's colonial program.

The government and its supporters chose to make a national issue of the campaign. They spoke of starving soldiers in Africa, of German military honor. Centrist opposition to the government's colonial policy was denounced as unpatriotic and lacking in love for the Fatherland. The campaign against the Center was not limited to denouncing its so-called " anti-national " nature. Although the government admonished its supporters not to stir up religious hatreds, the liberal and evangelical press in frenzied attacks charged that members of the Center, being Catholic, were unable to be patriotic since they were under the " clerical yoke " and since they received " orders for the settlement of political affairs from the Vatican." Count Posadowsky observed: " That isn't Center-baiting any longer—that is Catholic-baiting." The campaigners " for the honor and welfare of the German nation " directed their shafts against the Social Democrats as well, but the attack was not as spectacular or sensational as that against the Centrists.

In the election of January 25, while the Socialists lost heavily, the Centrists more than held their own. In fact, they increased the number of their seats in the Reichstag. Yet the position of the Center Party in the Reichstag was greatly changed. The national parties were strengthened by the defeat of the Socialists and did not need to depend on the vote of the Centrists on " national " bills. The elections represented a victory for the Bülow bloc. The significance of the elections lies in their part in the development of national sentiment. Patriotism was now identified with imperialism and *Weltpolitik*. The elections showed what a powerful force the label " patriotism " was in a national election; Bülow could win by representing his policies as patriotic and charging his opponents with being unpatriotic.

Dr. Crothers has done a splendid piece of research. He has made a contribution to a field quite largely neglected by American scholars. Perhaps his work will help to dispel the myth that the Reichstag was "merely a debating society", taught to a whole generation of American students. A study of the elections of 1907 offers one good corrective. The volume serves too as a contrast to Nazi political methods and suppression of today by presenting the freedom enjoyed in the elections of 1907.

Sylvester John Hemleben

Fordham University

AMERICAN HISTORY

War As A Social Institution. The Historian's Perspective. Edited for the American Historical Association by Jesse D. Clarkson and Thomas C. Cochran. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1941. Pp. xvii, 333. $3.50.)

When the members of the American Historical Association met in New York in December, 1940 their session was bound to be affected by the nation's preoccupation with World War II. It was also a time when considerable discussion about mental attitudes toward war called for many statements, particularly by historians whose sense of guilt—they had been treating war as a "pathological phenomenon"—required a good confession. So it was planned that way, and the present volume constitutes a selection of the papers read. We have various appreciations of the causes of war, its strategy and tactics, its effect upon the concept of neutrality, its larger influence on social institutions, and the implications of the present war to the United States. Furthermore, there is a vague philosophical unity in the book, inasmuch as all of the essays respond in some manner to a single query: how does a liberal society face the aberration of war? Or, more particularly, what is a liberal democratic nation to do when those who repudiate liberal assumptions develop a threat of superior force?

If the answers to this main question may be said to develop any general issue, there is a fair summary of argument in the paper of George E. Mowry and the accompanying discussion by Max Lerner. Mr. Mowry's analysis of "The First World War and American Democracy" is one that most students of our contemporary history will recognize as familiar and unusually well done. War, fought to the accompaniment of mass hysteria, was followed by a frustration which was manifest in mob violence and a materialism disguised as normalcy. Given these facts, Mr. Lerner does not dispute them, but demurs when faced with the implication that "democracy itself cannot survive war." To him, Wilsonian "idealism" had about run its course, and " war or no war, we were in for the sort of disillusionment that came from the recognition of how incompatible the Wilsonian brand of instrumentalism was with the realities of corporate capitalism." The key to the Marxist deprecation is the word, " instrumentalism; " and the critique is implemented further when he points out the fatal weaknesses. The New Freedom " had no real labor base, no good party base, no considerable administrative base, no base in a comprehensive economic strategy, no determined intellectual orientation." And the mob violence came from deeper sources, " the clash of interests and claims between groups and classes, from personal frustrations breaking through the cracks of the economic and legal structure." This last is the shrewd malevolence of Lenin, who saw in the total war of his day the promise of total revolution. Indeed, out of this war may " survive " an American brand of totalitarianism which contemporary cynics may be quite satisfied to call democracy.

Still, that there is some hope for the survival of liberal democratic society apart from dialectical materialism is the implication of " American Leadership in The Non-Totalitarian World," contributed by Benjamin H. Williams. The frame of reference is *A Study of History* by Arnold Toynbee, something this reviewer has yet to read, but the strategy prescribed is understandable as a proper twentieth century reorientation of the Monroe Doctrine. Emphasis is upon independence and the employment of our enhanced power to maintain international law among free nations. If we base our strategy upon this—it should be our strategy this time—there may be freedom under law for many of us. If, instead, we are merely to reissue the false coin of collective security, in which our power is used to serve one or another antithetical ideology, we can be sure of the disciplined liberalism which Mr. Lerner might like, and which Hilaire Belloc once described in *The Servile State*.

It would be impossible to make a brief review of the many challenging ideas offered by the other contributors. The editors have done well to group them and to provide suggestive introductions. There is also a fine index.

JOHN T. FARRELL

College of New Rochelle

The Continental Congress. By EDMUND CODY BURNETT. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1941. Pp. xvii, 757. $6.00.)

Two men in the course of the last one hundred sixty-five years have known the Continental Congress intimately. One of these was Charles Thomson, the first, last, and only secretary of the Congress from 1774 to its demise in 1789. The other is Edmund C. Burnett, author of this volume. It is indeed fortunate for the cause of American history that

Dr. Burnett has been prevailed upon to emerge from his years of research among the letters and papers of members of the " Old Congress " to give us this penetrating, humorous, and meticulously exact account of how they operated " in Congress assembled ".

The result is all that any student of history might desire, and more. For the first time the Congress stands revealed as the motor force of the American Revolution, the central pivot around which revolved the intricate mechanisms of a changing society. This is a picture that no amount of research in the papers of the Continental Congress could of itself provide. It is a picture that only intimate knowledge of the lives, the careers, and the literary relics of each of its members can make intelligible. In the most exact and literal sense, this is one of those books that require a lifetime of investigation and study to produce. The mass of materials involved precludes any briefer preparation.

It is therefore a matter of some amazement to find the result of labors so extensive not only eminently readable, but highly entertaining. *The Continental Congress* thus falls into a category by itself. This reviewer, at least, is not acquainted with any history of a legislative assembly that possesses these two qualities in such high degree.

Exactness and accuracy do not suffer by juxtaposition with literary excellence and good humor. Those who know Dr. Burnett's work on the *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress* will not be surprised at this. Because of the extensive documentation provided by him in the eight volumes of the *Letters* which he edited, the absence of footnotes from this volume will not offend the scholar, while it will delight the casual reader. Unfortunately the price of the book will operate to diminish the number of such readers.

It is impossible to suggest in a review of this length the true extent and complexity of the subjects with which Dr. Burnett's book deals. All phases of the Revolution were the concern of the Congress. Some attention is given to all of them, the result being that many apparently disparate developments of the period here assume their proper relationships. The total effect is one of unity, which adds much to our understanding of the Revolution. This is in itself a very notable contribution to the sum of knowledge concerning our national origins.

Another general conclusion which results from a reading of *The Continental Congress* is that our first independent government was not as inept and inefficient as it is sometimes depicted. That it had its evils, that it failed in many ways, is clearly evident. Dr. Burnett is no hero-worshipper! But that it was also responsible for the displacement of colonial discord by a dynamic national unity is a fact that emerges with equal clarity. Many things it attempted, and many things it likewise accomplished. It laid the foundation stones of a new republican order in America, and on those foundations was built our present system of government. For this at least we owe an eternal debt of gratitude to the "Old Congress".

Because of the fundamental character of this contribution to the understanding of American history, and because of the book's inherent literary merits, Dr. Burnett's work might have been expected to be a successful contender for the Pulitzer prize in history.

JOHN J. MENG

Queens College

Ton Histoire est une Epopée. Vol. I. *Nos débuts sous le régime anglais.* By ABBÉ ARTHUR MAHEUX. (Quebec: Charrier et Dougal. 1941. Pp. 212. $1.10.)

The lectures delivered by Abbé Arthur Maheux at Laval University in January and February, 1941 are here presented to the public in book form. Taking issue with the injunction made in 1845 by the historian François Xavier Garneau that French Canadians should beware lest they forsake any of the customs, opinions, or prejudices of their forefathers, the author maintains that the bitter feelings and resentment engendered in 1837 are now things of the distant past, so that men of today should be more broadminded than their forbears of Garneau's troubled days. In the conviction that more tolerant views should prevail over ingrained prejudice, he takes the field against the advocates of extreme nationalism and continued division among the people of Canada, and exposes the weakness of their position by examining the chief obstacles to good understanding between English and French speaking Canadians. Has not self-pity been overindulged, he asks? Has the lot of the French Canadians been really as hard as Garneau and his followers would have us believe? Did not Garneau exaggerate the misfortunes and unhappiness of his compatriots, and did he not err in ascribing all Canadian woes to the British? In answer to these questions Maheux sketches briefly the history of the Greeks, Poles, Irish and other peoples, and he shows that the tribulations of the Canadians were less numerous and less grievous.

Nor were the British the dreadful ogres they have been pictured. In the mid-eighteenth century when Quebec and Montreal capitulated, the laws of war offered scant protection or hope to the vanquished. Nevertheless the victors refrained from exploiting their advantages, and the terms they imposed were singularly mild. Murray proved to be extraordinarily humane towards Britain's new subjects, most considerate of their language, customs, laws, and religion, as numerous citations from his correspondence attest. He was a true friend and a protector of the French Canadians against an aggressive, rapacious, and intolerant English minority. Finally, misunderstanding of the facts alone can hold the

British responsible for the delay in the appointment of Briand in succession to Bishop Pontbriand. Detailed study of the evidence absolves the British of undue opposition or interference.

Through the medium of numerous extracts from the official register and from Murray's correspondence, Abbé Maheux appears to have established his thesis, but the title he gave his book seems scarcely warranted by its contents. Here and there are to be found statements difficult, if not impossible, of proof. For example, did the British colonists to the south of Canada excel the British in the homeland in hatred of Frenchmen and Catholicism? Did these same colonists really wish to "annihilate" their Canadian neighbors? Granted that Murray's strictures on the adventurers who came to Canada from New England were deserved, did he not regard those who came from England as little better? Shelburne's unpopularity was not due exclusively, or chiefly, to his conciliatory attitude towards the colonies. Finally, we submit that the Quebec Act is the best argument for England's tolerance and generosity towards her new subjects. Why then was no consideration of it included in this study?

CHARLES H. METZGER

West Baden College

Our Landed Heritage: *The Public Domain 1776-1936*. By ROY M. ROBBINS, Ph.D., Butler University. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1942. Pp. x, 450. $5.00.)

Besides a study of the liquidation of public lands in the United States from 1776 to 1936, with emphasis on its legislative history, this book introduces other factors which are related to its settlement, exploitation, and conservation. Running through the story of congressional action regarding land are lively sketches of the political, economic, and social by-products. These are peppered with the fascinating survey of the part sectionalism played throughout all.

By insisting on the contrast between the land legislation, which was generally good, and its application, which was often adverse, the author may justify his thesis that his book narrates the story of American democracy. He shows that the government, in the main, was interested more in the settlement of the land by the common man than in securing revenue therefrom. One of the drawbacks to this policy was the speed, extent, and number of the settlers and corporations, which kept ahead of adequate surveys, classification, administration, and control by the government. Besides it took a long time to realize that the lands of the high plains and Far West had to be planned and settled differently than was the case in the East and throughout the Mississippi Valley.

Hardly a finer survey respecting the interplay of sectionalism on the land problem is available than that outlined in this volume. The East was afraid of the West because of its threat to its political power and labor supply, and so the West and the South were allies for a time. Later, because easy settlement of the West meant markets and investments to the East, but to the South a threat to its economic system based on slave labor and large estates, the East and the West combined to counter southern land programs. When the East and West went in for conservation, which seemed to be against speedy settlement in the Far West, the latter put up a determined fight in opposition. Besides the story of sectionalism, the book presents a good outline of the friction between the federal policy and states rights.

The intricate history of the Preemption and Homestead Acts, with all their amendments and extensions, is well drawn. How these acts favoring the small settler were often evaded by corporations and individuals is skilfully told. The story of fraud introduces the absorbing question of morality. The author is aware of this and is content to sum it up as one of good and evil. The treatment of the Indian is not white-washed and the author is comprehensive and fair when he writes that the Indian, like all else, was subordinated to the drive for settlement. When lawmakers and the people became alive to the facts that all the land was not arable, that this kind of land was no longer to be had, and that immense underground and timber resources would be doomed, attention was directed to reclamation and conservation. So a policy of withdrawing public lands from entry by reservations was inaugurated.

The author furnishes the key to present economics. The intervention of the government in the land question was the introduction of its present role in other phases of economic life. When the frontier was definitely erased in 1935, by withdrawing public lands from entry, the question arose about a substitute for the traditional land-subsidy. It was expected that Uncle Sam should and would provide the answer.

Based on a wide and varied source material, this book, besides, has the guarantees of trained authorship, the amenity related to style, and good judgment. In Chapter VIII there is a fine summary of the causes for the phenomenal immigration to this country. Though the author mentions the effect of missionaries and church organizations on attracting settlers, he does not enter into specifications nor give references. Omitting details is justifiable in a work of this nature, and if references are lacking, it is perhaps due to the dearth of handy works in the field. We recommend this book.

PETER LEO JOHNSON

St. Francis Seminary

Readings in Pacific Northwest History—Washington, 1790-1895. Edited by CHARLES MARVIN GATES. (Seattle: University of Washington Press. 1941. Pp. ii, 345. $2.50.)

Charles M. Gates has previously edited *Five Fur Traders of the Northwest: Being the Narrative of Peter Pond and the Diaries of John MacDonnell, Archibald N. McLeod, Hugh Faries and Thomas Connor* (Madison, 1933) and *Messages of the Governors of the Territory of Washington to the Legislative Assembly, 1854-1889* (Seattle, 1940). This series of works, undertaken to present documentary material relating to the State of Washington, should be regarded as one of the most valuable collections on local history available.

The materials included in *Readings in Pacific Northwest History* are varied and well-balanced. There is proportionate emphasis upon the political, economic, social, and religious aspects of the development of the State. The editor notes in his Preface that Washington is rich in original documents—explorers wrote books about their voyages and their land trips; fur traders kept daily accounts of their impressions of the country and their contacts with the various Indian tribes; missionaries wrote diaries and reports to their home mission societies; army officers compiled data and government expeditions submitted elaborate reports. In addition, other types of records include letters from the pioneers, the early newspapers, tourist accounts, and " promotion " literature.

In the chapter devoted to " Early Explorers Visit the Pacific Northwest ", the account of the Spaniard, Don Manuel Quimper (1790) regarding the Nootka Sound controversy was followed by that of the British Captain Vancouver (1791), and within the space of a few years by the impressions of the American explorers, Lewis and Clark. In the chapter dealing with the Indians of the region, the accounts were from the pens of explorers, fur traders, and ethnologists. The minute descriptions of the fur trade were rounded out over a period of thirty years.

Perhaps one of the best balanced chapters in the *Readings* is the one entitled, " Missionaries Among the Indians ". Here is a subject which has caused unlimited controversy among writers on the activities of the Catholic and Protestant missionaries. Mr. Gates has chosen the accounts of Elkanah Walker and his wife, co-workers with the Whitmans and the Spaldings, for his version of the work of the Protestant missionaries, and those of Fathers Modeste Demers and François Norbert Blanchet for that of the Catholic missionaries. Both accounts are human in their appeal and by contrast show the common aspects and elemental differences in the work of the two groups. There are delightful accounts of the hospitality and kindliness of " the white headed eagle ", Dr. John McLaughlin, from the diary of John Work, one of his lieutenants, and from the writings of

Captain Wilkes who spent some time with that famous Catholic gentleman.

Other very enjoyable chapters deal with the army and the problem of military protection; overland travel; the coming of the railroads; the economic enterprises of lumbering, fishing, and mining; the development of agriculture; the growth of manufacturing and the appeals to tourists, immigrants, and sportsmen.

There is an appendix containing the Organic Act of March 2, 1853 and the Proclamation by the Governor of the Territory of Washington, I. I. Stevens, in 1855. One of the few real criticisms the reviewer can find with the book is the omission of an index. This omission detracts from the value of this volume so well done in other details. Since the selections represent frontier conditions in general, this work should be widely used as collateral reading in courses in frontier history.

SISTER M. EVANGELINE THOMAS

Marymount College
Salina, Kansas

America's Struggle for Free Schools. By SIDNEY L. JACKSON. (Washington: American Council on Public Affairs. 1941. Pp. viii, 276. Cloth, $3.50; paper, $3.00.)

This study is an investigation of the role that education has played in American culture in a specific crisis. The chronological period comprises the years 1827-1842, within which historians have to deal with Jacksonian democracy, agitation in favor of the common school, a major panic, and a variety of reforms. The particular geographical area includes New England and New York, contiguous communities making important educational progress in the 1830's and moving educationally at different speeds. The basic question is the social import of the Common School Revival. In other words, how far was the common man to rise in the period of Jacksonian democracy? The investigator has examined contemporary literature that was intended to reach the public in his effort to reveal the social tension in the struggle for free schools. His conclusions present very clearly the patterns of thought of the intellectual-professional group, but the ideas of the non-professional group are so enmeshed in the particular interests of the latter that they do not admit of definitive treatment.

The difficulty with a study of this kind lies in the interpretation of the data. There is a grave danger of viewing a specific situation like the one under discussion in the light of the complex social problems of the present crisis. That there is a striking analogy between the two is undoubtedly true, but analogy at best is a weak weapon of defense. The fifteen years between 1827-1842 were eventful years in the history of American thought and action. They bridge over two important periods in the history of the public school in this country: the period of nationalization which may be said to end about 1835, and the period of the great educational awakening previous to the Civil War.

By 1835 the experiment in democracy was proving successful and the leaders of the nation were convinced that the growth of democracy and the extension of the franchise called for an extension and improvement of education. The reform of education was but one of the many movements of the age aiming at human betterment. It was an age of idealism in which men saw visions of what American democracy might be expected to bring forth in the way of human welfare. Many of the ideas which they expressed were partly inherited from the past and partly imported from abroad. The age may have been afflicted with writer's itch or reformer's itch, but the messages of most of the writers and reformers were essentially humanitarian and idealistic.

The author maintains that a weakness in the educators' campaign in the struggle for free schools was their paternalistic attitude toward the masses. They failed to realize that the people, singly and collectively, have a right to decide for themselves what is best. May it not very well be that they clearly understood that what the people decide for themselves to be best may not always be best for them? It is desirable that we have trust and confidence in the masses, but it is a mistake to suppose that the masses must not be led. One of the many lessons learned from history is that the masses are destined to be ruled. It makes little difference whether the ruler be the aristocrat, the *primus inter pares,* or the man with the blade of steel, but the fact remains that the masses will be ruled. The thought and action of the masses will depend largely upon the philosophy of life and education held by the ruler.

The study has made a contribution in so far as the author has taken a great mass of source material and has succeeded experimentally, in arranging its ideas with a view to interpreting their social significance in relation to the central movement in the American republic a century ago—the Common School Revival. He has recognized that the limitations of his methodological technique have affected the validity of his interpretation.

FRANCIS P. CASSIDY

Catholic University of America

LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

Hernán Cortés, Conqueror of Mexico. By SALVADOR DE MADARIAGA. (New York: Macmillan Co. 1941. Pp. ix, 554. $4.00.)

We have here what many will justly regard as the best biography of the man who deserves a brighter page in the annals of Mexico than is generally accorded him. With the movement under way in Mexico to rehabilitate

Hernán Cortés (cf. for instance, T. Esquivel Obregón's *Hernán Cortés y el derecho internacional en el siglo XVI*, Mexico, 1939) Sr. Madariaga's contribution to this cause is not only very opportune but should also help greatly in furthering the movement in favor of the man who, to quote the author of this splendid volume, " was the first man who felt a Mexican patriotism " (p. 483), especially in view of the fact that a Spanish version of the biography appeared simultaneously in Mexico with the English one now under review.

The volume opens with a Prologue in which the author deals with the Aztec legend of " The Return of Quetzalcoatl " (pp. 3-16), immortalized a half-century ago by Lew Wallace in his story of *The Fair God*. The rest of the volume is divided into six parts. Part One, " Self-Discovery " (pp. 19-84), treats the career of Cortés as settler and official in the islands. Part Two, " Cortés Conceives the Conquest " (pp. 87-157), relates how he pursued his great venture up to the day when he burned his ships in the harbor of Vera Cruz. Part Three, " The First Conquest " (pp. 161-250), details the march of Cortés's army from Vera Cruz through Tlaxcala and Cholula to the city of Mexico, the capital of the Aztec " empire." Part Four, " Cortés Throws Away His Conquest " (pp. 253-318), discusses the problems that confronted the leader in the Aztec capital and the mistakes he made in trying to solve them. Part Five, " The Second Conquest " (pp. 321-391) tells the thrilling story of the struggle that ended with the fall of the capital and the capitulation of the Aztec chieftains. Part Six " Self-Conquest " (pp. 395-486), recounts the results of Cortés's heroic venture, ending with the last years he spent in Spain " Beyond the Conquest," when, as he himself wrote to the emperor and Madariaga does not fail to quote, he " was of an age . . . to retire and settle my account with God, for it is long, and I have little life left to put my case before Him, and it is better to lose one's wealth than one's soul " (p. 481).

Throughout the volume there are comments and judgments on the Spanish conquests in general and on the character of Cortés in particular that reveal the author's complete mastery of the sources and the fine scholarship with which he uses them. We agree with him when he says: " It is idle to follow Las Casas and believe that these expeditions [of the Spaniards to the New World] were all animated with a desire to rob, kill or kidnap the unfortunate natives " (p. 70). In connection with the title of " Doña " which was bestowed on the baptized Indian woman, the author points out correctly that this " detail proves to what extent the subconscious attitude of the Spaniards was one of racial equality and assimilation " (p. 118). After relating how Cortés appeared as defendant before the civil court he himself had organized in the new town of Segura de la Frontera, we find this significant observation: " There is, of course, artfulness in this attitude [of Cortés] and a kind of legalistic subtlety; yet it is based on the keen civic sense which still animated Spanish life, the decay of which in later years was to prove fatal both to the Mother Country and to her overseas Empire" (pp. 354-355).

As to Cortés in particular, there is this fine tribute: "Next to this confidence in his men, that faith in victory without which no victory is possible, Cortés felt the call to conquer vast territories and peoples for the Christian Empire whose soldier he felt himself to be. For him, the spread of the faith and that of the banner of Spain were one and the same thing—a thing so obvious as to admit neither doubt nor discussion." This attitude, the author continues, "should not surprise us in a man of his day, whatever his nationality, still less in a Spaniard, used by the protracted war against the Moorish invader to identify foreigners with infidelity and faith with patriotism" (p 187).

A misconception that should be corrected is in reference to Father Melgarejo. Sr. Madariaga knows better than to hold that "the friar transmuted sins into gold" (pp. 367, 371) and that as bearer of the *cruzada* he was "the alchemist of sin" (p. 407). The author also forgets that Brother Peter of Ghent and his two companions reached Mexico a year before the Twelve Apostles under Martín de Valencia (p. 426). Many readers will wonder why the name of the Aztec chief, commonly known as Montezuma, was rejected for the more cumbersome one, Moteçuçuma. On the other hand, the author is certainly correct in regarding as "utterly absurd" the use of the name *Cortez* instead of Cortés. "It seems to be due," he thinks, "to some confusion with the form *ez* of many Spanish patronymics such as Rodríguez or Fernández; which is very much as if we turned Washington into *Washingson* on the strength of *Jefferson* and *Jackson*" (p. 490).

Besides a lengthy bibliography in which, by the way, we miss the *Escritos Sueltos de Hernán Cortés* (Mexico, 1871), there are copious notes to each of the chapters. These notes, perhaps unfortunately, are assembled and put at the end of the volume (pp. 498-542). A valuable feature is the special index on Cortés. One chart (p. 158) traces the route of the army from Vera Cruz to Mexico City, while another (p. 392) depicts Mexico City and its environs at the time of the conquest.

For a scholarly, sympathetic, and truly fascinating biography of the conqueror of Mexico the reviewer strongly recommends the one contributed by Sr. Madariaga. It easily ranks with Prescott's classic in attractiveness of style and diction and it is far superior to it in correctness of interpretation and appreciation. High school and college libraries should not be without it.

FRANCIS BORGIA STECK

Catholic University of America

Gabriel García Moreno y el Ecuador de su tiempo. By RICHARD PATTEE. Introduction by Julio Tobar Donaso. (Quito-Ecuador: "Editorial Ecuatoriana." 1941. Pp. xx, 437.)

Richard F. Pattee, of the Division of Cultural Relations of the Department of State, has rendered another signal service to the world of scholarship, interested in the Latin American field, as well as to the best interests of inter-American understanding, by the publication of this timely volume. García Moreno has long interested historians, regardless of their faith or lack of faith, as a most remarkable *caudillo.* He is, in the language of the biologists, a *sport.* He fits no pattern, and his work in Ecuador, while head of the state, has fitted no convenient scheme of *caudillismo,* or of the ordinary political categories. He has been the subject of attack by anti-church *políticos* and historians and the object of praise by uninformed enthusiasts for the faith. It has remained for Mr. Pattee to give us an objective, calm view, based on a wide documentation and with full appreciation of both the critical and the fanatically appreciative appraisals of his career. In a work packed with citation to the best available sources, Mr. Pattee has given us the picture of an enlightened patriotic Ecuadorean, working for the best interests of his nation within the framework of what he visualized as a Catholic Christian society. No other North American scholar was better prepared in linguistic equipment and experience to tell this story. The reviewer can recommend its reading to all North Americans who read Spanish.

ARTHUR S. AITON

University of Michigan

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The Most Reverend Joseph Moran Corrigan, S.T.D., Titular Bishop of Bilta and Rector Magnificus of the Catholic University of America, died on June 9. He was born on May 18, 1879 in Philadelphia. Educated there and in Rome, he was ordained in 1903. Besides his experience in parishes and in settlement work among the Italians in Philadelphia he held the office of diocesan director of charities in his native archdiocese and was in charge of the Catholic Children's Bureau. Later he was made a professor at St. Charles Seminary, where he taught dogmatic theology. In 1925 he was made rector of that institution.

With a wealth of experience behind him he was named sixth rector of the Catholic University of America in 1936. In 1940 he was made a bishop, having previously been a monsignor and prothonotary apostolic. During his incumbency he erected Philosophy and Social Science into schools separate from the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. He erected the School of Nursing and the Department of Library Science. He reorganized the School of Sacred Sciences and reorganized and strengthened several departments in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. Through his efforts a new constitution was prepared for the University and approved by the Holy See. During his regime Archbishop Curley Hall, a faculty residence hall, was put up on the campus.

In connection with the new School of Social Science, Bishop Corrigan established the Commission on American Citizenship of the Catholic University of America and sponsored its publications. Just at his death its first volumes of textbooks for use in the first six grades of the parochial schools were coming off the press. He was deeply interested in Ibero-American relations and strove constantly to promote them. It was at his suggestion that the Institute of Ibero-American Studies was founded at the University.

Bishop Corrigan scintillated as a preacher and orator. His solid training as a theologian, his fine grasp of social problems, his passion for the democratic form of government, in combination with a polished style and magnetic personality, made him an inspiring speaker. He was sought after for addresses throughout the country.

If the more practical social sciences laid claim to his personal attention rather than history, he was always ready, without seeking to impose his views, to advise the editors of the REVIEW and the officers of the Association.

Among his characteristics were a great kindliness and keen sense of humor that endeared him to all those he met. He was deeply spiritual in his outlook. At the University he introduced adoration of the Blessed Sacrament throughout the school year. In his earlier years he had become interested in the laymen's retreat movement. He was a founder and constant guide of the Philadelphia Laymen's Week-End Retreat League. In death this league of men claimed him and he was buried at their Malvern Retreat House outside Philadelphia. His grave lies beside Corrigan Hall, the fine dormitory for retreatants that had just been erected in his honor.

Beloved by all who knew him, Father Gilbert J. Garraghan, S.J., the foremost authority on the history of the Jesuits in the United States, passed to his reward on June 7. He was a co-founder of the American Catholic Historical Association and a frequent contributor to the Catholic Historical Review. He was one of the inspiring forces in the Illinois Catholic Historical Society, whose quarterly *Review* (now *Mid-America*) profited largely by his archival researches. During his more than fifty years as a Jesuit he had taught at various universities conducted by his order. At the time of his death he was a member of the Institute of Jesuit History and a Research Professor of History at Loyola University, Chicago.

Among his writings were *Chapters in Frontier History, Catholic Beginnings in Kansas City, Missouri,* and *The Catholic Church in Chicago.* Father Garraghan had the satisfaction, shared by all his friends, of seeing the completion of the studies of a life-time in the publication of his three-volume work, *The Jesuits of the Middle United States* (New York, The America Press, 1938). A faithful attendant at the annual meetings of the Association, he will be missed by a host of fellow-workers in the field of American Catholic history.

His Eminence Alfred Cardinal Baudrillart died in Paris in March at the age of 83. He had been since 1907 Rector of the Institut Catholique. In 1893 he was ordained a priest in the Congregation of the Oratory. He returned to his chair of history at the Institut Catholique, where he was noted as an inspiring teacher. In 1921 he was made a bishop, in 1928 an archbishop, and in 1935 a cardinal with the unique privilege, for one not a residential bishop, of residing outside of Rome.

Under his able direction the Institut achieved sound academic development, and in recent years he was able to erect a new building, part of which houses the fine library of the school.

The cardinal was a trained historian. His great work was *Philippe V et la Cour de France* (5 volumes, 1890-1900). For it he twice received the Prix Gobert. Among other works he wrote *L'église, la renaissance, et le protestantisme.* He launched the vast project of the *Dictionnaire* *d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques* and became its first editor. Later he transferred it to the University of Louvain.

He was zealous for the welfare of his country as well as for the Church. France honored him by making him a commander of the Legion of Honor. In 1918 he was elected to the Académie Française. His father before him, Henri Baudrillart, distinguished economist, had been a member of the Institut de France and his maternal grandfather had been an academician.

At the time of the close of the annual meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association in Chicago last December it was not possible to inform the membership of the place and time of the annual gathering for 1942. It can now be stated definitely that the annual meeting of the Association will take place December 28-30 at Baltimore with the headquarters at the Lord Baltimore Hotel. This hotel will also be the headquarters of the meeting of the American Historical Association and the affiliated societies meeting concurrently.

The 1942 Liturgical Week will be held at St. Meinrad's Abbey, St. Meinrad, Indiana, October 12-16.

The Manuscripts Division of the Library of Congress resumed its regular reading room services on June 1. The division now is located on the third floor of the Annex Building. Many of the Library's important collections have been removed from Washington as a precaution against the possibility of damage from air raids. Because this material will not be available for either consultation or photoduplication, the Librarian advises students to correspond with the Manuscripts Division before coming to Washington to use its collections.

Many of our readers will be pleased to have their attention called to Professor Lane Cooper's *Plato on the Trial and Death of Socrates*: *Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo.* The works are translated into English with an introduction and prefatory notes. The handsome volume is dedicated to Fathers Cuthbert Lattey and Joseph Keating, Editors of the Westminster Version of the Bible. It is published by Cornell University Press (Ithaca, New York. 1941. Pp. xiv, 200. $2.00).

Bulletin No. 17 of *Progress of Medieval and Renaissance Studies in the United States and Canada* (Boulder: University of Colorado. April, 1942. Pp. 131. 75c), edited by S. Harrison Thomson, contains besides the usual features of the bulletin the following excellent review articles: "Recent American Scholasticism" by J. R. Cresswell; "A Decade of Research in Medieval Legal History" by Guido Kisch; "Studies on the Literature of the Spanish Renaissance" by O. H. Green. Additions and corrections are made to the "List of Medieval and Renaissance Holdings in American Libraries" which appeared in the preceding number. Manuscripts in

European libraries of which American scholars desire photostats are listed. There is a note confirming the fact that the journal, *Medievalia et humanistica,* mentioned in the January, 1942 issue of the REVIEW (p. 500) will be published.

Under its editor, Henri Grégoire, the first volume of the American Series of *Byzantion* appeared this spring. The 510 page issue corresponds with Volume XV (1940-1941) of the original series. Professor Grégoire has the assistance of numerous collaborating and advisory editors. S. H. Cross is the managing editor. The publication was made possible by the assistance of the American Council of Learned Societies and the generosity of Mrs. Robert Woods Bliss. The details of the rich table of contents appear in the Periodical Literature listed in this number. Subscriptions ($5.00 per annum) should be sent to Mr. Seth Gano, 199 Washington Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

A committee of American scholars has undertaken to continue publication of the *Slavonic and East European Review* hitherto published at the University of London. A new title, *The Slavonic Year-Book,* has been given to the American Series. Volume I (1941) corresponds with Volume XX of the former series. Several articles in the volume which have interest for the ecclesiastical historian are listed in our Periodical Literature. Henceforth the review is to appear semi-annually. Subscriptions ($5.00 per annum) should be sent to Professor S. H. Cross, Managing Editor, 545 Widener Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

During the scholastic year a series of lectures and papers were presented at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D. C., now under the auspices of Harvard University. A symposium on Byzantine history and art was held in the fall. Some of the papers have since been published by the Harvard University Press. Subsequently the following lectures were given: "L'An mille et la fin du monde" by Henri Focillon; "Dürer and Classical Antiquity" by Erwin Panofsky; "Greek Sculpture Comes to Rome" by Rhys Carpenter; and "Saint Thomas and the Problem of Evil" by Jacques Maritain.

Lynn White, Jr., in contributing "Christian Myth and Christian History" to the April issue of the *Journal of the History of Ideas,* has taken an historian's holiday to write as a theologian. The results from every viewpoint except style are disastrous.

The *Round Table of Franciscan Research* for March, 1942, contains two articles: "Lodovico and Raffaele da Fossombrone" by Fr. Celsus Repole; "Who Founded the Capuchin Reform?" by Fr. Eric May; and a translation of the first Capuchin constitutions (1536) by the Very Reverend Mark Stier.

The May, 1942 number of *St. Meinrad Historical Essays* (The Abbey Press, St. Meinrad, Indiana) contains the following articles: " Indians in Indiana " by Joseph Casey; " The Church is Catholic " [seven pages on the various rites] by George Muresan; " The Fact, Failure, and Future of International Government " by Thomas P. Ryan; " Steps Leading to Newman's Conversion " by Fr. Theodore Cilwick, Congr. Orat.; " Religious Debates [from Carroll to Lambert] by Louis J. Delahoyde.

The March, 1942 issue of the *Journal of Modern History* carries an interesting review article on " The Beginnings of French Imperialism in the Pacific Orient," by John F. Cady of Franklin College. The article treats the literature which has appeared on French activities in the Orient, particularly in Indo-China in the forties and fifties of the last century culminating in the establishment of French control there in 1861. Its value to readers of the REVIEW lies in its summary of the missionary histories. In these Mr. Cady pays special attention to the works of Abbé L. P. Adrien Launay, official historian of the Société des Missions Etrangères of Paris. Abbé Launay draws praise in contrast to what is termed " the partisan accounts of writers like Abbé Eugène Louvet." Other missionary historians whose works are mentioned with critical comments are R. P. Broullion, *Missions de Chine* (1855), Charles Lavallée, and LaServière. Regarding the works published on the Taiping Rebellion, Mr. Cady states: " The anti-rebel attitude of contemporary Catholic writers, such as LaServière and Broullion . . . was more characteristic of the French position (than the sympathetic accounts of Callery and Dr. Yvan); but these men did not base their opposition primarily upon the hybrid Protestant aspects of the rebellion, as some have supposed." The article closes with the Anglo-French war on China between 1857 and 1860, the pretext for which was offered by the judicial murder of Father Chapdelaine.

The Seventh Annual Report of the Archivist of the United States 1940-1941 is an interesting compilation of details concerning the work in the Archives. Among other things it discusses some general problems of records administration, defense activities, accessions, redistribution of records, their arrangement and description, and service on records. It contains several facsimiles. Appendix IV lists publications for which substantial information was obtained from material in the National Archives and Appendix V lists professional publications of the staff.

No. 12 of the National Archives Staff Information Circulars lists *Selected References on Phases of Archival Administration.* It is compiled by Solon J. Buck and Ernst Posner and represents a revision of Circular No. 6.

An Alphabetical List of Federal World War Agencies, 1914-21 has been published by the National Archives as Miscellaneous Processed Document No. 42-5.

Reference Information Circular No. 3 of the National Archives (April, 1942) lists materials in the Archives relating to Belgium, France, and the Netherlands. No. 4 lists materials relating to the Balkan States.

Religious Bodies, issued by the Census Bureau of the United States Government, is a handy volume for libraries and history departments. (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office. 1941. Pp. 943. $1.50).

The National Resources Planning Board has published a brochure on *The Protection of Cultural Resources Against the Hazards of War.* It is a sober presentation based on previous work and experience. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1942. Pp. 46. 10c).

A code of wartime practices for newspapers, magazines, and periodicals was issued recently from the Office of Censorship. Among the kinds of information to be withheld is that disclosing the new location of national archives, art treasures, and the like which have been moved for safekeeping.

The *American Historical Review* for April carries an article by William L. Sachse on the Chicago meeting of the Association. All sessions, both regular and joint-sessions, are described briefly. The joint session between the American Historical Association and the American Catholic Historical Association is noted on page 483.

The first number of a modest historical publication entitled *Gazette of the American Friends of Lafayette* appeared in February, 1942. It is sponsored by a Franco-American organization, the Society of the American Friends of Lafayette, which celebrated its tenth anniversary in May. The *Gazette* is a four-page leaflet published " sporadically " and edited by Professor Frank Monaghan of Yale University. It contains news and notes of interest to historians of Franco-American relations, as well as occasional brief documents. The first issue announced the development of a new venture by the Society—a publication program that envisages the preparation of a series of bound pamphlets devoted to the general field of Franco-American relations during the era of Lafayette. The initial item in this series is to be a folio publication of some sixteen pages, including a full-color reproduction of a map of Yorktown drawn by Du Perron in October, 1781. The second item will be a small book of some forty pages: the unpublished letters of Lafayette and his wife to Mr. and Mrs. John Jay, provided with an introduction and notes by Professor Monaghan. The Society's publications committee consists of Gilbert Chinard, Louis Gottschalk, Stuart Jackson, Theodore Norton, and Frank Monaghan.

Several years ago the *Franco-American Review,* an historical quarterly financed and edited jointly by Frenchmen and Americans, was forced to suspend publication after two years of existence. During those two years it presented many valuable articles and numerous important documents. With the suspension of publication, the remaining stock of copies of the journal was given to the Yale University Library, where they are available to any interested persons for a small fee. Orders should be addressed to Mr. Bernhard Knollenberg, Librarian.

The American Historical Association has recently announced that it will publish "Talleyrand's Notes on European-American Business Relations", edited by Hans Huth and Wilma J. Pugh. The letters and memoirs cover the period from June 10, 1794 to January 12, 1796.

The *Official Catholic Directory* for 1942 is considerably enlarged and improved. It contains, besides the usual statistics, a list of the religious orders of women in each diocesan summary together with a code number which refers to the section on religious orders of women and indicates the motherhouse of each. The *Directory* also contains an index of religious orders and of the dioceses by states. The chaplains under the Military Ordinariate are listed without addresses. They may be addressed c/o the War Department or the Navy Department, Washington, D. C. There are three different editions: No. I contains statistics on the Catholic Church in the United States; No. II adds statistics on Canada, Britain, Ireland, and Mexico; No. III has imitation leather binding. (New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons. $5.00, $6.00, $7.00).

The *Autobiography of Mathew Carey* is the first volume of a new series of reprints to be issued by Eugene L. Schwab, Brooklyn, New York. The series will be entitled "Research Classics." It will call deserved attention to the first prominent Catholic publisher in America, who, besides writing himself, introduced Irving, Cooper, Noah Webster, Freneau, and many other native writers to American readers.

Commemorating the second anniversary of its founding the Catholic Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania held a meeting in Pittsburgh on May 22. The Reverend Paul E. Campbell gave the presidential address on "Four Mighty Bishops of Yore." A paper, "Tara Hill: Seedling of the Faith in the Homestead District," was read by Mrs. T. S. O'Connor.

The *Wisconsin Magazine of History* for December, 1941 (pp. 178-186) contains a sketch of the life of Father John Hagen, S.J., with special emphasis on his Wisconsin years (1880-1888). Father Hagen, who was director of the Vatican Observatory for twenty-four years, wrote learned astronomical works in English, German, and Latin and contributed twelve articles to the *Catholic Encyclopedia*. William B. Faherty, S.J., is author of the sketch.

The April, 1942, issue of the *Missouri Historical Review* contains a sketch of Monsignor Timothy Dempsey of St. Louis, well-known for his numerous organized charities in behalf of the unemployed and destitute. The author of the sketch, Harold J. McAuliffe, S.J., is preparing a biography of the Monsignor.

Father John Rothensteiner will be remembered not only as the author of the *History of the Archdiocese of St. Louis* but also as a poet and a literary critic. Over 1800 of his letters, his manuscript autobiography, originals of his translations, press notices, reviews of his works, and his complete scholarly library of 12,000 volumes are now carefully housed in the Rothensteiner Archives at Mundelein College in Chicago.

General Charles G. Dawes, former Vice-President of the United States, has given his Evanston, Illinois home to Northwestern University for the establishment of a Northwestern Historical Center which will house one of the country's largest collections of documents concerning the Old Northwest Territory. Included in the gift is an endowment fund for maintenance of the house and collection.

The Quivira Society has entered on its second decade of publications with the issue of Volume XI (Albuquerque, 1942). Volume X, *A Scientist on the Trail,* from the pen of Adolph F. Bandelier, is in press and will be issued shortly. The latest volume presents *Three New Mexico Chronicles: The Exposición of Don Pedro Bautista Pino, 1812; the Ojeada of Lic. Antonio Barreire, 1832; and the additions by Don José Agustín de Escudero, 1849.* The translators, H. Bailey Carroll and J. Villasana Haggard, have also contributed fifty-eight pages of notes, which embody a fund of valuable information. One hundred and eighteen pages of plates reproduce the first two documents in facsimile. The volume contains much of interest and value to the church historian of our Catholic Southwest.

The April number of the *Hispanic American Historical Review* contains a style sheet for the use of those contributing to it. In general the University of Chicago's *A Manual of Style* is to be followed, but some cases occurring in Ibero-American history receive special treatment.

During the absence of John Tate Lanning in South America, Manoel Cardozo and Alexander Marchant are editing the August number of the *Hispanic American Historical Review.*

The Instituto de Investigaciones Esteticas of the National University of Mexico and the printery connected with that institution of learning deserve a word of congratulation on the publication of *Silleria del Cora de la Antigua Iglesia de San Agustín,* while Lic. D. Rafael García Granados and his collaborators merit high praise and commendation for the time and labor they put into this remarkably beautiful work. It is a collection, in two volumes, of photographic reproductions of the choir stalls which once adorned the Church of St. Augustine in Mexico City and which are now preserved in the Escuela Preparatoria of the National University. There are eighty-one photographs in the first volume and eighty-eight in the second. Preceding the first set and bound separately is a special study and introduction, prepared by García Granados, who also furnished for each of the photographs the biblical text which the old wood carver set out to illustrate. It is truly remarkable how many details the artist succeeded in putting into his carvings. Like so many works published in Mexico in recent years, this one demonstrates the high cultural status which obtained in Mexico in colonial times and the laudable attention which Mexico today is directing to this culture.

The American Catholic Historical Association and the editors of the Catholic Historical Review congratulate Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes, former President of the Association, on his appointment as ambassador to Spain. While it is a gratification to his many friends and admirers, and while Professor Hayes is eminently well fitted for the exalted position, no one will fail to realize that he faces an arduous task. Our prayers and good wishes accompany him.

A citation in recognition of his distinguished service to the cause of understanding and co-operation among Catholics, Jews, and Protestants was presented to Professor Hayes at a reception April 30 in New York given by the board of trustees of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Mr. Hayes has been Catholic co-chairman of the National Conference since 1928.

Daniel Sargent has been named to the board of editors of the Catholic Book Club. Mr. Sargent was President of the American Catholic Historical Association in 1936.

Professor Richard J. Purcell of the Catholic University of America gave the presidential address on "The American Way of Life" at the annual meeting of the Middle States Association of History and Social Science Teachers held in Frederick, Maryland, April 24 and 25.

The Reverend Demetrius Zema, S.J. was recently appointed Head of the Department of History at Fordham University to succeed Mr. Jeremiah F. O'Sullivan, who is now a captain in the Army Air Corps.

Helen C. White, Professor of English in the University of Wisconsin, received the Laetare Medal from the University of Notre Dame this spring. Miss White is distinguished for her historical novels, and several of her other writings are of an historical nature.

At the forty-fifth annual dinner of the American Irish Historical Society, on May 2, Charles D. Maginnis, outstanding architect, was awarded the Society's medal for 1942 " in tribute to his eminence in architecture and art."

Edward Reilley, Assistant Professor of American History at John Carroll University in Cleveland, has been appointed by Governor John W. Bricker to the Ohio War Historical Commission. In World War I a history commission under the direction of Arthur M. Schlesinger did valuable work in collecting materials which would represent Ohio's effort in the war. The purpose of the present Commission is similar. Any and all records which will enable the historian of the future to reconstruct the picture of the part played by Ohio in World War II will be assembled. Dr. Reilley has been assigned the task of collecting documents ilustrative of Catholic activity in this gigantic effort. To aid him in this work, the History Department at John Carroll is circularizing the Catholic educational institutions of the state for pertinent data such as diaries and letters of men in the service and for useful statistics.

Dr. Dieter Cunz of the University of Maryland is engaged in writing a history of the Germans in Maryland. He would be grateful for the privilege of borrowing source materials, such as historical records, letters, diaries, or newspapers, relating to this subject.

The May issue of *Columbia* contains a eulogy by Richard J. Purcell on Charles Hallan McCarthy for thirty years, 1909-1939, Head of the Department of History of the Catholic University of America. Professor McCarthy died on December 22, 1941.

A lengthy obituary notice of Charles Edward Chapman appears in the *Hispanic American Historical Review* for February.

On May 22 the city of Montreal began the observance of its tercentenary with an open-air Pontifical Mass in Jeanne Mance Park.

Loretto Heights College in the Archdiocese of Denver observed the centenary of its founding on June 3.

St. Andrew's Church in New York City celebrated its 100th anniversary on March 19. Among many distinguished former parishioners perhaps the most outstanding was Cardinal Hayes. One of the former pastors, the Right Reverend James McMahon, who served from 1880-1891, later erected and endowed McMahon Hall at the Catholic University of America.

Nativity parish in New York City celebrated its centenary on June 7. Since 1917 the parish has been in the charge of the Jesuits.

Our Lady of Sorrows Church in New York City celebrated its 75th anniversary on May 17. It is in charge of the Capuchin Fathers.

The Religious of the Cenacle are observing the fiftieth anniversary of their coming to New York.

St. Anthony's Messenger published by the Cincinnati Franciscans of St. John the Baptist Province celebrated its golden jubilee in June. The Reverend Hyacinth Blocker, O.F.M., is the present editor.

The Historical Bulletin celebrated its twentieth anniversary with the publication of its May issue. An anthology composed of articles published in former issues and believed to be most useful for students and teachers of history is planned in commemoration of the event.

Documents: A Memorandum Book of Elias Joneston [keeper of processes relating to Aquitaine, 1306 ff.]. G. P. Cutting (*Speculum,* Jan.).—The Fifth Letter of Nicholas of Autrecourt to Bernard of Arezzo. Julius R. Weinberg (*Journal of the History of Ideas,* Apr.).—United Irish Plans of Parliamentary Reform. R. B. McDowell (*Irish Histor. Studies,* Mar.).—Letters of Charles Carroll, Barrister [cont.]. (*Maryland Histor. Mag.,* Mar.).—A French Tribute to Charles Carroll of Carrollton. Helen I. Cowan [trans.] (*ibid.*).—Correspondance de Parkman [cont.]. Abbé Maheux (*Le Canada Français,* Apr.).—American Sectionalism and World Organization, by Frederick Jackson Turner. William Diamond (*Amer. Histor. Rev.,* Apr.).—Two letters from Bishop Henni's correspondence to the Ludwigmissionsverein, Munich. Peter Leo Johnson (ed.) (*Salesianum,* Apr.).—Christian Traugott Ficker's Advice to Emigrants [cont.]. (*Wisconsin Mag of Hist.,* Mar.).—A Pacific Northwest Bibliography, 1941. Harry N. M. Winton (*Pacific Northwest Quart.,* Apr.).

BRIEF NOTICES

Argenti, Philip P. (Ed.). *Chius vincta, or the Occupation of Chios by the Turks (1566) & their Administration of the Island (1566-1912); Described in Contemporary Diplomatic Reports and Official Dispatches.* (Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co. 1941. Pp. cclxxvii, 264. $6.00.) About half of the documents in this collection are from Genoese archives, and deal with the difficulties of the Genoese chartered company in Chios known as the Mahona. They reveal the financial difficulties which faced the company, partly because the Turks continued to increase the amount of tribute required, and partly because the company did not administer its affairs properly. As a result of this poor management the home government in Genoa had little sympathy for the Mahona in its hour of need. Payment of the tribute was overdue, and in 1566 the Turks decided to listen to no more excuses. An expedition was sent against the island, and it was brought completely under Turkish control. The Genoese were expelled, and those of their children, deemed suitable, were taken for the Sultan's harem. Documents from British, Austrian, Venetian, Florentine, and Vatican archives, which are also included in the collection, are concerned almost exclusively with the events of 1566.

The Introduction of 277 pages which Mr. Argenti provides, give an account of the Mahona, and of the occupation and administration of the island by the Turks, based upon the documents he has collected, and upon secondary material. There is considerable useless repetition. The material on page cxxxvi, for example, is largely a repetition of that on page xl; also, the dates given in the two places for the conquest of the island by John Vatatzes are inconsistent. In general, it appears that the Introduction, though interesting and in some ways helpful, was not very carefully prepared. The chief value of the book, it seems, is the collection of documents concerning the operation of the Mahona in Chios. (Walter W. J. Wilkinson)

Bogart, Ernest L. *Economic History of Europe, 1760-1939.* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1942. Pp. xiii, 734. $4.50.) It is obviously impossible to give a volume of this scope an adequate review in a few words. Professor Bogart, after all, requires no introduction to economic historians. In general, it would seem that the volume does its job too well in presenting the facts of economic history from the Industrial Revolution to our time. The book really seems to be of more use as a sort of encyclopedia than as a text for college classes. Students are too likely to be lost in the maze of detail.

There is also a disappointing failure on the part of the author to discuss the implications of the mass of facts he presents. All of us interested in the fate of our world are trying to look ahead, to analyze the probable effects of current economic trends. The author, however, studiously avoids coming to conclusions. For example, he sums up in a few words the fate that has overtaken modern industrialism in a world of inevitably shrinking markets (p. 564);

but makes no statement about the effects of the breakdown of modern capitalism except a passing reference to cartels and to national economic planning.

Particularly annoying is an optimistic note concerning the progress of modern industry, from the very beginning of the Industrial Revolution to our time. Reading this volume in conjunction with Toynbee's *A Study of History,* one cannot help but believe that Professor Bogart has been blinded by the superficial achievements of technology and is consequently unaware of deep-lying causes of distintegration in the heart of our culture.

The bibliographies which follow each chapter are particularly elaborate and up to date, making the volume the more useful as a handy reference work. (WALTER JOHN MARX)

BUCK, PHILIP W. *The Politics of Mercantilism.* (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1942. Pp. viii, 240. $2.00.) The scope of this well-documented volume is more limited than its title would indicate, for it is almost exclusively concerned with the political doctrines of English mercantilist writers. Professor Buck does not discuss, save by way of summary, the legislation and the administrative organization and activities of mercantilism as a going concern—a work so admirably done by Heckscher's *Mercantilism.*

Professor Buck's theme is handled in a clear, orderly, and comprehensive style. He provides us with a brief digest of the historical backgrounds of mercantilist teaching, and with a careful examination of the principal tenets of mercantilist economic dogmas. The central portion of the book is devoted to a discriminating study of the political principles elaborated by the merchant pamphleteers and to an exposition of the political programs and organizational framework proposed by them to carry out their national economic ambitions. The importance of the work lies in his successful endeavor to explore the interdependence of political and economic ideas as exemplified in mercantilist literature. Contemporary interest in political economy as distinct from the separate sciences of politics and economics should draw attention to this work.

If there is a weakness in this kind of a book, it is a failing common to the best of historical studies of political theory; that is, it deals too much with the exposition of ideas and too little with the way these ideas make themselves felt in history.

The volume contains good bibliographies and indices. (CHARLES O'DONNELL)

CALOGERAS, JOAO PANDÍA. *A History of Brazil.* Translated and edited by Percy A. Martin. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1939. Pp. xxiii, 374. $5.00.) The present volume is one of a series intended to present to English language readers the national history of the principal Latin American countries as related by their own historians. The volume on Brazil, translated and carefully edited by the late Percy Alvin Martin, fills perhaps a greater need than the translations of the histories of the Spanish-speaking republics. Portuguese has been a little more inaccessible and the bibliography of Brazil less familiar to the students of this area in the United States. This volume is one of the best presented of the several that have already appeared.

The choice of the one volume history of Pandía Calogeras is the result of the dearth of adequate histories of Brazil that bring the story of the evolution of that people down to the more or less immediate present. Few of the standard histories that are used in the schools and institutions of the country describe the course of events beyond the fall of the empire. For this reason the *Formação historica do Brasil* of Calogeras was chosen for this series.

The selection is by no means ideal. The style of the author is far from flowing. His construction and method of presentation is often extremely difficult. Professor Martin deserved the utmost credit for rendering into excellent English what was certainly not an easy or facile text in the original. It is curious to note that few of Brazil's great historians have been even moderately passable stylists in their own tongue. Oliveira Lima, Capistrano de Abreu, Calogeras, etc., have all been somewhat on the arid side in their presentation. Professor Martin's is not an exact or slavishly literal transcription of the original. The translator took many liberties which were entirely justified. One of the best features of the English translation is precisely the material that has been left out. The notes, explanations, and above all the bibliographical study at the end, are features that make this translation preferable in many ways to the Portuguese text from which it was taken. (Richard F. Pattee)

Da Silva, Owen, O.F.M. (Tr. and Ed.). *Mission Music of California.* (Los Angeles: Warren F. Lewis. 1941. Pp. xx, 132. $7.50; de luxe edition, $25.00.) After reposing for many long years in various libraries and museums of California, the manuscript music which the Franciscans and their Indian converts used in California's mission days has at last been assembled and made available by one who is himself a Franciscan of the Santa Barbara Province and an accomplished musician. Collaborating with him in the production of this beautiful volume were Arthur M. Bienbar who furnished the accompaniments and chirography and Paul A. Moore who produced the pen sketches with which the volume is so artistically enriched. In the well-written Preface (pp. 3-25) Father Da Silva presents the results of his researches concerning "Mission Music" and "Padre Musicians." A valuable document discovered by him is the "Prólogo" (pp. 28-33) which one of the friars of old, Father Narciso Durán, wrote at San José Mission in 1813.

The main portion of the volume (pp. 37-113) contains the musical transcriptions which the editor made from the original manuscripts. The pieces transcribed total more than seventy music plates. There are two complete Masses, the "Missa de Cataluna" and the "Missa Viscaina," both of which were very popular in mission days. In the Notes appended to these transcriptions the editor furnishes historical data concerning them and offers practical suggestions for a rendition of the music by present-day choirs.

As to the artistic make-up of the volume, it is as much a real credit to the publishers as its contents is to the editor and his collaborators. The reviewer concurs with John Stephen McGroarty when he says in the Foreword: "The most exquisite of all the gifts the Mission Fathers brought, save the boon of Christianity, was music. And here, in this lovely and most precious book, is that gift preserved and made safe in all its tender beauty. It is a service for which the world, and California in particular, cannot fail to be grateful" (p. ix). (Francis Borgia Steck)

V
194

EASUM, CHESTER V. *Prince Henry of Prussia, Brother of Frederick the Great.* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 1942. Pp. 403. $5.00.) On July 31, 1758, Joseph Yorke wrote, after his special mission to Frederick the Great: "One thing surprised me a great deal, and that was the silence his brothers observe when they are at table with him; for, unless he addresses himself immediately to them, they never open their lips, but sit by him in the most respectful silence, whilst other people are talking familiarly..." (*The Life and Correspondence of Philip Yorke, Earl of Hardwicke*, III, 220). This silence might have been their way of showing their dislike for the older brother, who never let them forget that he was king and who had written six years earlier in his Political Testament about how a prince should be handled. His treatment of his brothers during the Seven Years' War was consistent with that view. His brother Henry showed his ability and that he could be depended upon; therefore he was advanced to second in command and also to an independent command. That part of Prince Henry's career was the most important, and Professor Easum has rightfully placed his emphasis there. After Chapters I-III, which may be considered introductory, Chapter IV-XIV pertain to the Seven Years' War, and Chapters XV–XXVII to the remaining years. Although the number of chapters in the third subdivision is greater, there are more pages about the war, and the author speaks of the years 1763-1802 as "the long twilight of a life spent in the shadow of the throne and of his own heroic deeds."

A comprehensive study of manuscript and printed sources, an understanding of human nature, and an ability to write well are the excellent combination found in this biography. "Compliance is always more gratifying to a masterful person than nonconformity, especially when that person is an elder brother *in loco parentis*." This is one of many examples which might be given to show how judiciously Professor Easum has comprehended and summarized. The end-paper maps, the illustrations, the explanatory footnotes, a table of the Hohenzollerns, and the good index are supplementary aids. (MARY LUCILLE SHAY)

GINNEKEN, JAC. VAN, S.J. *Trois textes pré-Kempistes du premier livre de l'Imitation* (Edités et commentés . . . à l'occasion de l'anniversaire sexcentenaire de Gérard Groote. 1340-1940.) [Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde. Nieuwe Reeks, Deel XLIV.] (Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij. 1940. Pp. 156. 4.50 florins.) Father van Ginneken edits four different texts of the *de imitatione Christi* in parallel columns, the last of which gives the text of Thomas a Kempis. The first text, *editus per quendam Cartusiensem in Rheno,* is, van Ginneken insists, the work of Gerard Groote, who was a Carthusian oblate for a time. There are several manuscripts of this text. The second text, of which he knows only a single manuscript, van Ginneken attributes to Gerard Zerbolt (1394), a disciple of Groote. The third text he assigns to the Carthusian Henry Eger (d. 1408), who published it with his own *Exercitatorium.* In his historical introduction the editor admits that, though history favors his thesis, the historical evidence for the fact that his first text is the oldest is not conclusive. It is on the philological arguments mustered together in an epilogue that he relies. He is himself a philologist, and he lists passage after passage to prove that his order of the texts is chronological. Among other things he shows how Eger and Thomas a Kempis introduced the cursus. In general the texts as they are arranged show development from a cruder to a more polished form. The succeeding redactions made use of one or more of the earlier texts. One would wish that the editor paid more attention to the arguments of scholars who have not accepted his thesis. At times it would appear as if he were more concerned about gaining his point than in establishing the truth. Of several misprints the only ones of consequence noted are a misplaced period on p. 16, l. 30 and a date, 1936 for 1396, on p. 18, l. 29. Father van Ginneken promises to edit the Latin texts of the second and third books of the *de imitatione*. (Aloysius K. Ziegler)

Gottschalk, Louis. *Lafayette and the Close of the American Revolution.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1942. Pp. xiii, 458. $4.50.) This volume completes Professor Gottschalk's exhaustive study of Lafayette's participation in the American Revolution; it traces the activities of the young general from his return to France in 1779 to his retiring to his estates in the Midi in March, 1783. By the author's admission the earlier chapters follow in the footsteps of Tower and Doniol but the last four chapters investigate a hitherto less well-known period of the marquis' career. In a sense therefore they are a real contribution to knowledge, but scholars will likewise be grateful for the detailed study of the Yorktown campaign. The appendix dismisses as aprocryphal or unfounded various legends about Lafayette.

In these pages Lafayette's whole-soled devotion to America and to the men in his army shines forth. Whether in France or in his adopted land, in command or in subordinate position, he was tireless as well as ingenious in promoting their interests and relieving their needs. Outstanding too was Lafayette's warm personal, even filial, attachment to Washington which came to be recognized by everyone. At times his soul knew conflict when this loyalty stood in the way of his gratifying another powerful impulse, his desire for glory. One observes moreover the gradual but definite development of democratic and humanitarian sentiments in Lafayette, an education shared by other French officers and privates who saw service in a land where the principles of royalty and absolute government did not prevail.

We think that the author errs in saying that Spain's dilatoriness in recognizing the independence of the United States was due to "fear of a strong Protestant republic in the Western Hemisphere" (p. 356), and we suggest that it was due, as he admits elsewhere, to her fear that it would have a bad effect on her own extensive colonies in the New World and might prompt them to imitation. The remark of the Spanish sovereign, that he would oppose the appointment of Lafayette to the civil governorship of Jamaica in the event of its conquest "because he would make it a republic", reveals the touchstone of Spanish policy.

Professor Gottschalk has devoted fourteen years to his trilogy on Lafayette and the American Revolution. His researches have brought him to the great libraries and repositories of documents here and in Paris and London. Scholars will be gratified to have his assurance of another volume in which he will study the role of Lafayette in the French Revolution. (CHARLES H. METZGER)

HAGGARD, J. VILLASANA, and MALCOLM DALLAS MCLEAN. *Handbook for Translators of Spanish Historical Documents.* (Austin: University of Texas Press. 1941. Pp. vii, 198. $1.50.) For anyone working in Spanish historical documents this handbook will prove a very useful aid in solving some of the problems that these documents obviously present. After briefly discussing in three chapters the theory of translating, the palaeographical features of Spanish manuscripts, and the method of procedure in translating, the authors devote the fourth and main chapter to "Special Aids," grouping them under the following five heads: Standardized Expressions, Expressions with Special Meaning, Abbreviations, Weights and Measures, and Monetary Terms. The final chapter deals with the technicalities connected with the transcription of documents. The last part of the volume is eminently practical. Thus in the first appendix the authors reproduce photographically, transcribe, and translate seven documents. In the next appendix they present specimens of Spanish handwriting, showing how in course of time the handwriting changed. The third and final appendix reproduces and identifies the letters of the alphabet as they were "used in Spain and her colonies from the twelfth through the nineteenth centuries." The bibliography is a long list of books and articles that bear on the subject of the handbook. What, besides its wealth of information, makes the handbook decidedly valuable is the fact that it grew out of the authors' long years of actual work in Spanish manuscripts. It is an aid and guide for which students of Spanish American history owe the authors a debt of gratitude. (FRANCIS BORGIA STECK)

HERMENS, F. A. *Democracy or Anarchy?* (Notre Dame, Indiana: Review of Politics. 1941. Pp. xxx, 447. $4.00.) Professor Hermens of the University of Notre Dame has made a very careful examination of the theory and practise of proportional representation and has concluded that it is unsound on both scores. Proportional representation is essentially unsound in theory because it is based on an erroneous conception of representation—a conception outmoded by the democratic process itself and one that provides mathematicians but not political scientists with a problem for solving. Proportional representation is dangerous in practise because it makes it difficult to achieve the harmonious consent of a whole people to the peaceful transfer of power from one group to another: Irreconcilable factions lead to force and dictatorship.

The demonstration of this general thesis is supported by a detailed consideration of the operation of proportional representation in Europe and America. Both the scholarship and argument of the book support the general thesis of the unsoundness of proportional representation. But Professor Hermens' estimate of the majority system is not critical enough to persuade the reader wholly to his side. His treatment of the American political scene contains many naive assumptions. He omits any real consideration of the tendency of the majority system to create an inner ring of boss control and an outer ring of popular apathy. The author has shown perhaps that proportional representation is not the remedy; he has not quite shown that the defenders of proportional representation were wrong in seeking some device for rectifying the weaknesses of the majority system. (Charles N. R. McCoy)

Johnson, Richard A. *The Mexican Revolution of Ayutla, 1854-1855.* (Rock Island, Illinois: Augustana College Library. 1939. Pp. 125. $1.50.) This short essay on an interesting period of republican Mexican history was written originally as a doctoral dissertation in the University of Texas and published in a monographic series by Augustana College.

In general it is encouraging to note that there is somewhat of a tendency in the institutions of higher learning of this country where Hispanic American studies have found a niche to devote increasing attention to the national period. Important as is the colonial epoch and fascinating as are many of its problems, the evolution of these republics during the past century constitutes an extremely vital and relatively uncultivated field. Fortunately the history of Mexico, for reasons that are obvious, has received more attention from American scholars than that of any other republic. Its proximity and agitated history since the establishment of independence plus the intimate contact with the United States have led to a goodly number of substantial as well as superficial studies on various aspects of its national development.

The present volume is no epoch-making contribution to an understanding of Mexico. It is exactly what it pretends to be—a thesis for the Ph.D. with all the limitations that this implies. There is a certain undercurrent of feeling against the clerical party, and a bias in favor of the reform and of liberalism. This view is not, however, annoyingly persistent nor does it impinge on the general accuracy and validity of the narration. It is natural that the American student of Mexico should be moderately seduced at least by the great reform movements that have swept that republic. It is difficult to distinguish at times between the actual and the ostensible motives involved. Liberalism has been a potent banner that has often disguised a system of thought and of action little different from the forms of government which it proposed to overthrow.

The scholarly apparatus of the volume is entirely orthodox. In the light of the incredible number of bad books on Mexico, this may be accounted one of the better. (Richard F. Pattee)

Kent, Sherman. *Writing History.* (New York: F. S. Crofts and Co. 1941. Pp. xi, 136. $1.00.) The reviewer does not know of any book which will give the student of history more of practical value for a dollar than this slender volume. Both graduate and undergraduate students will profit by the suggestions and advice offered by Professor Kent. There is nothing of the trite in the presentation of his theme, and there is considerable humor.

There is first a chapter on "Why History" which shows the ubiquity of history, its use, and the several stages of historical criticism. The succeeding chapters deal with the more practical considerations of Finding the Perfect Topic, the Elements of Research, Organizing Material, Writing, Style and Usage (including sections on the appearance of the manuscript, footnotes, citations, consistency in usage, capitalization, punctuation, the preface, introduction, and appendixes), the Bibliographical Notes, and as an appendix some useful rules for Making an Index. Throughout there are bibliographical

V
194

references to wider reading on the several topics. Unfortunately, Professor Hockett's well-known *Introduction to Research in American History* (1931) is not mentioned.

Graduate students will probably profit more from the use of this book than undergraduates. The latter are likely to find it at places beyond their usual elementary grasp. It is to be hoped that writers of doctoral dissertations and their elders who may be preparing for more mature publication will note particularly what the author has to say of forms of citation and consistency in usage. In the reviewer's experience he has found these lapses to be the most frequent occasions of the mechanical sins of historical writers. (LEO F. STOCK)

MACK, EDWARD C. *Public Schools and British Opinion Since 1860.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1941. Pp. xii, 511. $3.75.) The present volume deals with the relationship between the English public school and the current forces which molded its growth since 1860. In a preceding volume the author made a study of this relationship prior to that date. The author has undertaken to comprehend the nature of public school development by means of a critical analysis of the opinion of a large proportion of those who have expressed themselves regarding public school education. He has paralleled this history of opinion with a history of the public schools as a background of actual fact, describing the condition of the schools at various periods and pointing out the changes which they have undergone or the changes which they have resisted in the last eighty years.

The changes in the public schools between 1800 and 1870 were the result of a struggle between the older ruling classes and the new middle class. Since the late nineteenth century labor has played the part of the middle classes. Labor never gained substantial admission to the public schools and made no effort to reform them in terms of its needs. The plain fact is labor has built its own schools and has sought to destroy rather than to reform the public schools.

The conservatives maintain, in their defense of public school education, that the modern public school produces leaders who are intelligent, disciplined, self-sacrificing, and socially sympathetic. The author observes that whatever be the virtues and possibilities of the public school man, the inefficiency and lack of vision in high places may be laid in part at the door of the public schools. He contends that the public school system has done little to make England ready for 1939. The upper classes and the public schools have preferred to compromise with liberalism rather than actually to defy it. The public schools have, he fears, liberalized themselves just enough to destroy themselves. The author offers a compromise plan in this matter of reform of the public schools. He suggests that they accept state aid and state interference in order that the best elements of the working class may gain admission to them. While public school aims would of necessity be modified to include liberal and working-class aims, the schools would yet remain semi-independent boarding schools, emphasizing training for citizenship. (FRANCIS P. CASSIDY)

O'Connor, John J. *The Catholic Revival in England.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1942. Pp. ix, 102. $1.00.) *The Catholic Revival in England* is the fourth volume to appear in the Christendom Series. Under the capable supervision of Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes, the Christendom Series seeks to present a group of popular studies in Church history by competent scholars. This general purpose must be kept in mind when one reads the volume, for it is not a piece of research but a survey of the movement for the general reader and the inquisitive student. The essence of the revival is here; the sure touch which comes from mastery is evident in the selection of the pertinent details and in the author's judgments. An amazing amount of matter is packed into the narrow compass of one hundred pages: the Relief Acts, the work of O'Connell, the Oxford converts, Irish immigration, restoration of the hierarchy, the first provincial synod, the labors of Wiseman, Newman versus Manning, the university question, papal infallibility, revealing statistics, even incisive pen pictures of the leading figures. And all is told with stylistic appeal. Terminology that may confuse — such as provost, chapter, Propaganda, vicar apostolic—is always explained in a footnote. A select bibliography is appended to the text. The omission of an index is a defect, but with this exception the *Catholic Revival in England* is a gem of compression. (Frederick E. Welfle)

Rupp, George Hoover. *A Wavering Friendship: Russia and Austria, 1876-1878.* [Harvard Historical Studies. Vol. XLIX.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1941. Pp. xiv, 599. $5.00.) This volume traces the clash of the Balkan policies of Austria and Russia, two partners in that flimsy diplomatic combination, the first Three Emperors League. Dr. Rupp has made use of hitherto slightly worked Russian sources—the official documents in the *Krasny Archiv*, and the memoirs of Ignatyev and Kartsov in *Russkaya Starina*; he has worked in the Vienna Imperial Archives, and, in general, combed a staggering mass of materials. The result is a definitive treatment of the Near East crisis of the 1870's that adds a good deal to our knowledge.

The chief interest of the book lies in its emphasis on Russian policy. The gradual but steady propulsion of Russia toward the conflict with Turkey, despite the divergent Balkan points of view of moderates like Alexander II and Gorchakov and radical Pan-Slavs like Ignatyev; the economic and financial chaos in Russia; the bitter personal jealousies of the Russian diplomatists, are given careful (and sometimes repetitious) analysis. Austrian policy was largely that of Andrassy. The Austrian Chancellor (already plagued by the South Slav problem in the Dual Monarchy) would have liked to keep Turkey intact; but, that proving impossible, he preferred to take Bosnia and Herzegovina rather than see them fall to Serbia.

A Wavering Friendship is not well written. The style is prolix and tedious; one word is never used where three will do. A volume concerned with geographical details in negotiations and agreements certainly ought to include a few maps. But there are three valuable appendixes, a really excellent critical bibliography, and a well-done index. All in all, it is a valuable book. (Francis A. Arlinghaus)

V
194

Tozzer, Alfred M. (Ed.). *Landa's Relación de las Cosas de Yucatán. A Translation.* (Cambridge: Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University. 1941. Pp. xiii, 394. Cloth, $6.25; paper, $4.75.) This is a most complete and an exceedingly elaborate translation of Father Landa's much-cited work on the Maya Indians of Yucatán among whom the energetic friar labored as missionary for thirty years (1549-1579). The volume is in every respect a credit to the erudition and scholarship of Mr. Tozzer, outstanding authority on the ancient Mayas, and of his two chief collaborators, Messrs. Roys and Scholes, well known to students of early Yucatán history. It might well serve as model for contributions of this kind, the importance of which cannot be overstated.

About two-thirds of the volume (pp. 3-208) contains the text of the English translation of the *Relación*, enriched with more than a thousand footnotes. These notes are decidedly more than mere bibliographical and critical references. Many of them are detailed discussions of issues suggested by the *Relación* or lengthy citations from recognized works dealing with the early history of Yucatán.

A highly valuable feature of the volume is the Syllabus (pp. 243-333), in the construction of which the editor must have spent many hours of careful and tedious study. It makes it easy for the reader to gather from the text of the *Relación* and the appended footnotes, desirable information on many and varied topics relating to the central subject. There is a rich bibliography (pp. 337-364) and a most serviceable "Concordance, giving," as the editor points out, "the folio and page numbers of the manuscript and the editions in relation to the present work" (p. 367).

The comment in footnote 93 (p. 16) on Landa's statement "...and thus God provided Cortes with good and faithful interpreters" that "God also provided Cortes with a mistress" in the person of Marina might well have been omitted. It is too flippant a statement, to say the least, for a serious and scholarly work of this kind. However, the reviewer hastens to add, this is the only passage in the entire volume that he had to score as objectionable. Nor does it prevent him from recommending this latest edition of Landa's *Relación* as a valuable mine of firsthand and scientific data on the beginnings of Spanish rule in Yucatán. It is a worthy contribution to science, meriting high praise for exhaustive research and sound scholarship. (Francis Borgia Steck)

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

MISCELLANEOUS

What Shall We Test? P. J. Ross, Jr. (*Social Studies*, May).
Is World History Being Taught for Civic Purposes? Clarice J. Weeden (*ibid.*).
A Renaissance Pedagogical Device. W. B. Faherty (*ibid.*).
Maps for Victory. Gilbert Grosvenor (*National Geographic Mag.*, May).
War in Prehistoric Societies. V. Gordon Childe (*Sociological Rev.*, July-Oct., 1941).
Ethical Standards and Political Strategies. Dorothy Fosdick (*Political Science Quart.*, June).
The Forging of Fascist Doctrine. Clarence H. Yarrow (*Journal of the Hist. of Ideas*, Apr.).
Some Antecedents of the Theory of the Corporative System. John Clarke Adams (*ibid.*).
A Coptic Counterpart of a Vision in the Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas. Johannes Quasten (*Byzantion*, Vol. XV, 1940-1941).
Synesius, a Curialis of the Time of the Emperor Arcadius. C. H. Coster (*ibid.*).
The Calendar-Reform at Antioch in the Fifth Century. Glanville Downey (*ibid.*).
Coronation and its Constitutional Significance in the Later Roman Empire. Peter Charanis (*ibid.*).
Byzantium and Southern Russia: Two Notes. I. The Eparchy of Gothia. II. The Date of the Conversion of the Khazars to Judaism. George Vernadsky (*ibid.*).
Digenis Akritas. Alison Frantz (*ibid.*).
Notes on the Byzantine Epic. Henri Grégoire (*ibid.*).
Remarks on the Date of the Menologium and the Psalter Written for Basil II. Sirarpie Der Nersessian (*ibid.*).
A Chrysobull of the Emperor Andronikos II Palaiologos in favor of the See of Kanina (Albania). P. J. Alexander (*ibid.*).
Internal Strife at Byzantium in the Fourteenth Century. Peter Charanis (*ibid.*).
Y eut-il des invasions russes dans l'empire byzantin avant 860? G. Da Costa-Louillet (*ibid.*).
Vagrant Folios from Family 2400 in the Free Library of Philadelphia. H. R. Willoughby (*ibid.*).
Writings Familiar to Cecaumenos. Georgina Buckler (*ibid.*).
A Christian Legend in Moslem Garb. G. Levi della Vida (*ibid.*).
The Diversion of the Fourth Crusade. Henri Grégoire (*ibid.*).
Inflation and Its Implication in Early Byzantine Times. Angelo Segrè (*ibid.*).
The Legislation of Justinian in the Light of the Papyri. Raphael Taubenschlag (*ibid.*).
The Significance of the Crusaders' States in Mediaeval History. J. L. La Monte (*ibid.*).
The Empire of Trebizond in History and Literature. A. A. Vasiliev (*ibid.*).
The Mongol Orders of Submission to European Powers, 1245-1255. Eric Voegelin (*ibid.*).
Why Another Optative Dissertation? Martin J. Higgins (*ibid.*).
The Legacy of Henri Pirenne. Gray C. Boyce (*ibid.*).

A Romantic Approach to the Middle Ages. E. K. Rand (*Mediaeval Studies,* Vol. III, 1941).
The So-Called Square Nimbus. Gerhart B. Ladner (*ibid.*).
The Canzone d'Amore of Cavalcanti according to the Commentary of Dino del Garbo. Otto Bird (*ibid.*).
L'Humanisme de Saint Thomas d'Aquin. Jacques Maritain (*ibid.*).
Maistre Nicole Oresme, Le Livre du Ciel et du Monde. Albert J. Menut and Alexander J. Denomy, C.S.B. (*ibid.*).
The Prohibition of Marriage against Canons in the Early Twelfth Century. T. P. McLaughlin, C.S.B. (*ibid.*).
Rhetoric in the Middle Ages. Richard McKeon (*Speculum,* Jan.).
Corrigenda and Addenda to the Descriptions of the Plimpton Manuscripts as Recorded in the De Ricci *Census.* S. A. Ives (*ibid.*).
Popular Authors of the Middle Ages. Hilda Buttenwieser (*ibid.*).
Vincent of Beauvais and Chaucer's *Monk's Tale.* Pauline Aiken (*ibid.*).
Usk's *Testament of Love* and St. Anselm. George Sanderlin (*ibid.*).
The Lords of Le Puiset on the Crusades. J. L. La Monte (*ibid.*).
Recent Studies in Medieval Latin Hymns. Ruth Ellis Messenger (*Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association,* Vol. 71, 1940).
How much of the *Annotationes in Marcianum* is the Work of John the Scot? E. K. Rand (*ibid.*).
Manuscripts of Ovid's *Fasti*: The Ovidian Tradition in Middle Ages. Hilda Buttenwieser (*ibid.*).
The Fourth Gospel and the Church. Robert M. Grant (*Harvard Theological Rev.,* Apr.).
Homilía de S. Basílio sobre o jejum [Portuguese translation with introduction]. Anon. (*A Ordem,* Mar.).
I et II Catequeses Mistogócicas de S. Cirilo de Jerusalem [Portuguese translation with introduction]. Anon. (*ibid.*).
Cyprian, the Father of Western Christianity. Arnold A. Ehrhardt (*Church Quart. Rev.,* Jan.-Mar.).
The Cathedral Treasurer in the Middle Ages. A. L. Browne (*ibid.*).
La querelle de deux saints, saint Jérôme et saint Augustin. Georges Simard, O.M.I. (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa,* Jan.-Mar.).
The Guild Social Order. Thomas Manning, O.M.I. (*ibid.,* Apr.-June).
A Pythagorean Idea in Jerome. Johannes Quasten (*American Journal of Philology,* Apr.).
Gregory the Great. Sister M. Aquin (*Histor. Bulletin,* May).
L'art à Rome au temps de la persécution des iconoclastes. Emile Mâle (*Revue des deux mondes,* Oct. 1, Oct. 15, 1941).
The Carmelite Rite. Part II. Leo J. Walter, O.Carm. [trans.] (*Sword,* Apr.).
The Origin of the Carmelite Laybrothers. Joachim Smet, O.Carm. (*ibid.*).
St. Bernardine of Siena, The Popular Preacher. Cuthbert Gumbinger, O.F.M. Cap. (*Franciscan Studies,* Mar.).
Raphael's Disputa. Harry B. Gutman and Philotheus Boehner, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).
The *Centiloquium* Attributed to Ockham (Part IV and V). Philotheus Boehner, O.F.M. (*ibid.,* Mar. and June).
Misinterpretation of Aristotle by Galileo. Rudolf Allers (*New Scholasticism,* Apr.).
The Mediaeval Theory of the Tyrant. Wilfrid Parsons, S.J. (*Rev. of Politics,* Apr.).
Orestes A. Brownson's *The American Republic.* Thomas I. Cooke and Arnaud B. Leavelle (*ibid.*).
The Literature on War. William O. Shanahan (*ibid.*).
A Good Word for the Inquisition. W. F. Rea (*Month,* Jan.-Feb.).
Pope Pius XII and Peace: From 1939-1941. John Murray (*ibid.*).
Four Centuries of Political Idolatry. Ross Hoffman (*Thought,* June).
Saint Thomas More, Theologian. Gerald Kernan, S.J. (*ibid.*).

The Lay Feoffees: a Study of Militant Puritanism. Ethyn W. Kirby (*Journal of Modern Hist.*, Mar.).
Cardinal Bérulle and Mr. Huxley [The true character of seventeenth-century French spirituality]. Ronald Knox (*Tablet*, May 2).
Pauline Jaricot. A Daughter of Lyons. Mina J. Moore (*Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Feb.).
Aldous Huxley and Catholic Mysticism. Aelred Graham, O.S.B. (*Tablet*, Mar. 28).
The Catholic Church in Japan. James Brodrick, S.J. (*Tablet*, Mar. 7).

EUROPEAN

The Scholarship of St. Lawrence of Brindisi. Cuthbert Gumbinger, O.F.M.Cap. (*Franciscan Studies*, June).
Recent Work on the French Revolution. Beatrice F. Hyslop (*Amer. Histor. Rev.*, Apr.).
Adjustments and Maladjustments after the Napoleonic Wars. W. W. Rostow (*Papers and Proceedings* of the 54th annual meeting of the American Economic Association, Dec., 1941).
Forgotten Dictator [Napoleon III]. Benjamin J. Blied (*Social Justice Rev.*, June).
En el Primer Centenario de la Obra Máxima de Balmes [editorial]. Raimundo Gonzáles, S.J. (*Christus*, Apr.).
La mission en Espagne du cardinal Gerlier. Pierre Lyautey (*Revue des deux mondes*, Aug. 15, 1941).
L'affaire d'Espagne (1807-1809). Louis Madelin (*ibid.*, Oct. 1, Oct. 15, Nov. 1, 1941).
Spain Under the Nationalists. Robert Hodgson (*Tablet*, Apr. 4).
Giovanni Pico della Mirandola. Part I. Ernst Cassirer (*Journal of the Hist. of Ideas*, Apr.).
An Unpublished Royal Correspondence from the Archives of Turin [between Anne of Savoy, wife of Victor Amadeus, King of Sicily, and her youngest son, Charles Emmanuel]. Margaret R. Toynbee (*Month*, Jan.-Feb.).
The Thirty Years War of the Twentieth Century (1914-1944) and the Lotharingian Peace. Henri Grégoire (*Belgium*, May).
Hans Holbein and the Coverdale Title Borders of 1535 and 1539-41. Harold R. Willoughby (*Anglican Theological Rev.*, Apr.).
Bishop Ketteler and the Prussian Programme. Anon. (*Tablet*, Mar. 28).
The Pan-German Movement. W. O. Henderson (*History*, Dec. 1941).
The Short-Lived American College at Muenster in Westphalia, 1866-85? Part I. John M. Lenhart, O.F.M.Cap. (*Social Justice Rev.*, May).
A Struggle for Austria in Berlin and Frankfort: 1849-1855. Frederic Engel-Janosi (*Journal of Central European Affairs*, Apr.).
Croatia in European Politics. Dinko Tomašić (*ibid.*).
Problems of the Reign of George of Poděbrady. Otakar Odložilík (*Slavonic Year-Book*, American Series, Vol. I, 1941).
The Papacy, the Bavarian Clergy, and the Slavonic Apostles. P. J. Alexander (*ibid.*).
The Status of the Russian Church during the First Half-Century Following Vladimir's Conversion. George Vernadsky (*ibid.*).
Clio in Chains: Czech Historiography, 1939-1940. Otakar Odložilík (*ibid.*).
Lithuania: An Outpost of Catholic Europe. Stanislaw Mackiewicz (*Tablet*, May 16).

BRITISH EMPIRE

The Making of Domesday Book. V. H. Galbraith (*English Histor. Rev.*, Apr.).
Some Aspects of the Career of Archbishop Pecham. Part II. M. D. Knowles (*ibid.*).
Receivers of Petitions and Clerks of Parliament. A. F. Pollard (*ibid.*).
The Anglo-Belgian Agreement of 12 May, 1894. M. P. Hornik (*ibid.*).

The Excommunication of Grosseteste in 1243. Marjorie M. Morgan (*ibid.*).
Some Unexplored Records of the Enclosure Movement. W. E. Tate (*ibid.*).
Anglo-Norman and the Historian. M. Dominica Legge (*History*, Dec. 1941).
New Light on George Saville, First Marquis of Halifax, "The Trimmer." H. C. Foxcroft (*ibid.*).
The Suppression of the Alien Priories. Marjorie M. Morgan (*ibid.*).
The Syncategoremata of William of Sherwood. J. Reginald O'Donnell, C.S.B. (*Mediaeval Studies*, Vol. III, 1941).
The Use of Prohibitions by Clerics against Ecclesiastical Courts in England. G. B. Flahiff, C.S.B. (*ibid.*).
The Doctrine of Divine Ideas and Illumination in Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln. Lawrence E. Lynch (*ibid.*).
Early English Clergy [continued]. P. H. Reaney (*Essex Rev.*, Apr.).
Duns Scotus and the English Reformation. Ladislaus Siekaniec, O.F.M. (*Franciscan Studies*, June).
Japanese and English in the Seventeenth Century. James Brodrick (*Month*, Mar.-Apr.).
The Rise and Fall of the Belfast Cotton Industry. John J. Monaghan (*Irish Histor. Studies*, Mar.).
The Relations between O'Connell and the Young Irelanders. Randall Clarke (*ibid.*).
Magna Carta Hiberniae. H. G. Richardson (*ibid.*).
Sir Niall Garbh O'Donnell and the Rebellion of Sir Cahir O'Doherty. Seán O Domhnaill (*ibid.*).
Writings on Irish History, 1940; With Addenda, 1939. David B. Quinn (*ibid.*).
Michael Davitt in Penal Servitude. T. W. Moody (*Studies*, Mar.).
Irish Stories and Storytellers. Seamus O Duilearga (*ibid.*).
Dictionary of Irishmen in France. Richard Hayes (*ibid.*).
Gormanston Castle in Irish History. Aubrey Gwynn, S. J. (*ibid.*).
A Notable Centenary: Roscrea [concluded]. Michael Breathnach (*Irish Monthly*, May).
Commenarius Rinuccinianus. John MacErlean, S.J. (*ibid.*).

AMERICAN

Washington and the Catholics, II. Gilbert J. Garraghan, S.J. (*Histor. Bulletin*, May).
Tom Paine: Victim of the Rights of Man. R. R. Palmer (*Pennsylvania Mag. of Hist. and Biography*, Apr.).
The Significance of the Letter to the Abbé Raynal in the Progress of Thomas Paine's Thought. Darrel Abel (*ibid.*).
Tom Paine and the Idea of Progress. V. E. Gibbens (*ibid.*).
Democracy as Understood by Thomas Jefferson. Louis Martin Sears (*Mid-America*, Apr.).
Edward L. Doheny and the Beginnings of Petroleum Development in Mexico. Fritz L. Hoffmann (*ibid.*).
Luis de Valdivia, Defender of the Araucanians. Beatrice Blum (*ibid.*).
Henry George and American Catholicism. Frederick J. Zwierlein (*Social Justice Rev.*, May and June).
William Paca, Signer, Governor, Jurist. Albert Silverman (*Maryland Histor. Mag.*, Mar.).
Reading Interests of Maryland Planters and Merchants, 1700-1776. Joseph Towne Wheeler (*ibid.*).
Indians and Early Explorers in the Valley. Walter H. Buck (*Virginia Mag. of Hist. and Biography*, Apr.).
Declension in a Bible Commonwealth. Perry Miller (*Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*. Apr.).
The Reverend Robert Jenney. Edgar Legare Pennington (*ibid.*).
Fontaine Leval, A French Settlement on the Maine Coast, 1791. Frances S. Childs [ed.] (*ibid.*).

Acadian Exiles in Pennsylvania. Wilton Paul Ledet (*Pennsylvania Hist.*, Apr.).

Philadelphia and the Open Pulpit Controversy. Edward Hawks (*Records of the American Catholic Histor. Soc. of Philadelphia,* Mar., 1941).

Father Claude Jean Allouez, S.J. Catherine Fennelly (*ibid.*).

Foundations of Catholic Sisterhoods in United States, 1850. Sister Maria Alma (*ibid.*).

Venerable John Nepomucene Neumann. Fourth Bishop of Philadelphia. Albert W. Waible, C.SS.R. (*ibid.*).

Pennsylvania Men and the Church. William W. Sweet (*General Mag. and Histor. Chronicle,* Apr.).

Father Dyer—Memories. (*Voice,* Mar.).

When America Was Young [brief history of St. Patrick's Church, Baltimore]. Nicholas Dohony (*ibid.*, Apr.).

Charles Juchereau de St. Denys: A French Pioneer in the Mississippi Valley. Norman W. Caldwell (*Mississippi Valley Histor. Rev.*, Mar.).

Illinois Indians on the Lower Mississippi, 1771-1782. Stanley Faye (*Journal of the Illinois State Histor. Soc.*, Mar.).

Etienne Véniard de Bourgmond in the Missouri Country. Henri Folmer (*Missouri Histor. Rev.*, Apr.).

Father Timothy Dempsey. Harold J. McAuliffe, S.J. (*ibid.*).

Missouri Miniatures—Father Peter John De Smet. (*ibid.*).

Peter John De Smet: Missionary to the Potawatomi, 1837-1840. W. L. Davis, S.J. (*Pacific Northwest Quart.*, Apr.).

The Historic Rural Church [Address at the Mid-West Regional Meeting of the Missions Council of Congregational Christian Churches]. Roy E. Bowers (*Ohio State Archaeological and Histor. Quart.*, Apr.-June).

Travel Notes of a Mid-Nineteenth Century Frenchman [Jean Jacques Ampère]. Bertha Ruth Leaman (*ibid.*).

Archbishop Vilatte [Part III]. Joseph Marx and Benjamin J. Blied (*Salesianum,* Apr.).

The Catholic Church in the U. S. in 1869. John M. Lenhart, O.F.M.Cap. (*Social Justice Rev.*, Apr.).

The Story of Nashotah. Donald H. V. Hallock (*Histor. Mag. of Protestant Episcopal Church,* Mar.).

The Reverend John Stuart, D.D. (1740-1811), Missionary to the Mohawks. John W. Lydekker (*ibid.*).

City Founded in Valor [tercentenary of Montreal]. W. A. L. Styles (*Columbia,* Apr.).

Champlain et Montréal. Léo-Paul Desrosiers (*Le Canada Français,* Apr.).

Pages d'histoire [a collection of notes on Canadian history]. Arthur Maheux (*Le Canada Français,* May).

Le neophyte Ahuntsic. Archange Godbout (*Le Bulletin des Recherches Historiques,* May).

Educateurs d'autrefois—anciens professeurs de l'école normale Laval: J. B. Cloutier, 1831-1920. C. J. Magnan (*ibid.*).

Carmel in the Northern Valley. Ch. II. Stephen J. McDonald, O.Carm. (*Sword,* Apr.).

Carmel in Puerto Rico. Simon M. Serrano, O.Carm. (*ibid.*).

Panama Canal: The Dream of Four Centuries. Dieter Cunz (*South Atlantic Quart.*, Apr.).

The Mexican Oil Industry since Expropriation. Arthur W. Macmahon and W. R. Dittmar. (*Political Science Quart.*, Mar. and June).

Economic Factors in Latin America. James A. Magner (*Shield,* Apr.).

The Figure of Pancho Villa in the *Corridos* of the Mexican Revolution. Donald F. Fogelquist (University of Miami *Hispanic American Studies,* Mar.).

The Legal Theory of Forced Labor in the Spanish Colonies. James J. Carney, Jr. (*ibid.*).

The Case of Cuba: A Program for Immediate Action. Juan Clemente Zamora (*ibid.*).

El Pan-Hispanismo, el Panamericanismo y la cooperación enter los países hispanoamericanos como tres filosofías de desarrollo internacional. Robert E. McNicoll (*ibid.*).

El Beato Sebastián de Aparicio. Jesús García Gutiérrez, S.J. (*Christus,* Apr.).

Santo Toribio Alfonso de Mogrovejo. Jesús García Gutiérrez (*ibid.*, May).

Recuerdos de mi vida [cont.]. Archbishop Leopoldo Ruiz y Flores (*ibid.*).

Le fundación de Río de Janeiro. Basilio de Magalhaes (*Universidad Católica Bolivariana,* Oct.-Nov., 1941).

Best Sellers of the Lima Book Trade, 1583. Irving A. Leonard (*Hispanic American Histor. Rev.,* Feb.).

Evolution of the Free Slave Trade Principle in Spanish Colonial Administration. James Ferguson King (*ibid.*).

The Historicity of the 1494 Discovery of South America. William Jerome Wilson (*ibid.*).

Reservations Regarding the Historicity of the 1494 Discovery of South America. Charles E. Nowell (*ibid.*).

Las ideas filosóficas y religiosas del Libertador. J. A. Cova (*Boletín de la Academia Nacional de Historia,* July-Dec., 1941).

El Ecuador en la independencia de América. Carlos A. Vivanco (*ibid.*).

Observations upon American Policy in the Philippines. Harold W. Bradley (*Pacific Histor. Rev.,* Mar.).

Japan and the American Annexation of the Philippines. James K. Eyre, Jr. (*ibid.*).

BOOKS RECEIVED

Albright, William Foxwell, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1942. Pp. xii, 238. $2.25.)

Atwater, Elton, *American Regulation of Arms Exports.* Monograph Series of Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Division of International Law, No. 4. (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 1941. Pp. x, 287. $2.00.) This monograph covers the years from 1793 to 1941, before the United States entered the present war. It has a large bibliography and an excellent index.

Beers, Henry Putney, *Bibliographies in American History. Guide to Materials for Research.* (New York: H. W. Wilson Co. 1942. Pp. xv, 487. $4.75.)

Brock, W. R., *Lord Liverpool and Liberal Toryism 1820 to 1827.* (Cambridge: At the University Press; Toronto: Macmillan Co. 1942. Pp. 298. $2.25.)

Burt, Alfred Leroy, *A Short History of Canada for Americans.* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1942. Pp. xvi, 279. $3.00; Text edition, $2.50.)

Bussard, Paul, *The Meaning of the Mass.* Edited by Felix M. Kirsch, O.F.M.Cap., for schools and discussion clubs. (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. Distributed by P. J. Kenedy and Sons. 1942. Pp. xiv, 329. $2.25.) Father Bussard's book on the Mass published two years ago was received with great acclaim. He gives the authentic meaning of the Mass. Without making it too obtrusive he succeeds in including much of the historical background of the liturgy. Father Kirsch has skillfully added the touches that convert the work into a textbook. The illustrations done by Adé de Bethune are very attractive, and Kenedy has done an excellent job of printing and binding.

Considine, John J., M.M., *March Into Tomorrow.* (New York: Field Afar Press. 1942. Pp. 87. $2.00.) For those whose hopes are shaken by the present dreary outlook for order and decency in the Far East, this beautiful little volume by Father Considine will bring fresh courage. It is a story told in Maryknoll's own engaging manner with many splendid pictures of the activities of the Maryknollers in China, Japan, and Korea. Anything done by Maryknoll is of interest to American Catholics and this book—so enhanced by the expert photography—will help to bring the work of these missionaries before a wider audience in a most attractive way.

Constant, G., *The Reformation in England II. Introduction of the Reformation into England, Edward VI (1547-1553).* Translated by E. I. Watkin. (New York: Sheed and Ward. 1942. Pp. ix, 349, and Index. $4.00.)

Curtiss, John S., *An Appraisal of the Protocols of Zion.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1942. Pp. vi, 118. $1.00.) Dr. Curtiss, author of the able monograph on *The Church and State in Russia,* conducts here a thorough investigation into the authenticity of the Protocols of Zion which raised such serious controversy when they first appeared in the fall of 1903 in a Russian newspaper. The author's analysis led him to the conclusion that these documents were pure forgeries. His evidence was examined by a distinguished group of American historians who concur entirely with Professor Curtiss' conclusions. The little volume will be of real help in laying the ghost of this source upon which a good deal of anti-semitism has fed.

Cushman, Robert E., et al., *The Impact of War on America.* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1942. Pp. vi, 159. $2.00.)

De Montmorency, Sir Geoffrey, *The Indian States and Indian Federation.* (Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co. 1942. Pp. viii, 165. $1.25.) This little volume is No. 14 of the Current Problems Series under the general editorship of Ernest Barker.

Dumond, Dwight Lowell, *A History of the United States.* (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1942. Pp. viii, 882. $4.00.) A one-volume text for colleges covering the years from 1603 to the present with many maps and an extensive bibliography.

Dunham, Chester Forrester, *The Attitude of the Northern Clergy toward the South, 1860-1865.* (Toledo: Gray Co., Publishers. 1942. Pp. xi, 258. $3.50.)

Ellard, Gerald, S.J., *The Dialog Mass.* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1942. Pp. xvi, 223. $2.75.) This new publication of the professor of liturgy at St. Mary's College, Kansas gives proof of the growth and development of the movement for participation of the people in the Mass.

Farrell, Sister M. Xavier, *Happy Memories of a Sister of Charity.* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1941. Pp. vii, 190. $2.00.) According to the prologue which has been signed, The Scribe, the book is ". . . a true convent yarn, and also the story of the foundation in Western Pennsylvania by Mother Seton's Daughters. . . . It will not be dry history, made up of statistics and lists of names, but a story as interesting as a fairy tale." The book is just what the scribe states. It can be enjoyed by persons from eight to eighty. Its chief charm lies in its simplicity.

Fichter, Joseph H., S.J., *Saint Cecil Cyprian.* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1942. Pp. xi, 282. $2.50.)

Fifty-Eighth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution 1940-1941. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1942. Pp. 13.)

Giddens, Paul H., *The Beginnings of the Petroleum Industry, Sources and Bibliography.* (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical Commission. 1941. Pp. vii, 195.) This volume contains fifty-three letters belonging to Dr. F. B. Brewer, nineteen letters which belong to G. H. Bissell together with an eighty-page bibliography and a full index. The letters deal with the establishment of oil companies and wells in western Pennsylvania.

Goodspeed, Edgar J., *A History of Early Christian Literature.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1942. Pp. xiii, 324. $2.50.)

Guérard, Albert, *The France of Tomorrow.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1942. Pp. xxi, 287. $3.50.)

Hackett, Charles Wilson, *Pichardo's Treatise on the Limits of Louisiana and Texas.* (Austin: University of Texas Press. 1941. Pp. xxii, 623. $6.50.)

Hart, Charles A., (Ed.), *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association.* Vol. XVII. *Philosophy and Order.* Seventeenth Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, December 29-30, 1941. (Washington: Office of the Secretary of the Association, Catholic University of America. 1941. Pp. 204. $2.00.) The brief section devoted to the history of philosophy consists of a roundtable discussion on the value of the historical study of Christian philosophy before St. Thomas Aquinas and of modern Non-Thomistic philosophy.

Hoever, Hugo H., S.O.Cist., *"I Pray the Mass", Sunday Missal.* (New York: Catholic Book Publishing Co. 1942. Pp. 447. $1.10.)

Hulme, Edward Maslin, *History and Its Neighbors.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1942. Pp. 197. $2.00.)

Huntington, Emily H., *Doors to Jobs. A Study of the Organization of the Labor Market in California.* (Berkeley: University of California Press. 1942. Pp. xviii, 454. $3.50.) This monograph by an associate professor of economics in the University of California is pretty summarily described in its sub-title. In addition to its eleven chapters it contains a number of statistical charts and tables, many of which have been left to constitute an appendix at the end of the volume.

Hyma, Albert, *The Dutch in the Far East. A History of the Dutch Commercial and Colonial Empire.* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: George Wahr Publishers. 1942. Pp. vii, 249. $1.75.)

Keller, Charles Roy, *The Second Great Awakening in Connecticut.* (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1942. Pp. ix, 275. $3.00.)

Kelsen, Hans, *Law and Peace in International Law.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1942. Pp. xi, 181. $2.00.)

Kerr, Hugh Thomson, *Preaching in the Early Church.* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co. 1942. Pp. 238. $2.50.)

Lasnier, Rina (Comp.), *Bulletin bibliographique de la Société des Ecrivains Canadiens.* (Montreal: Editions de la Société des Ecrivains Canadiens. 1942. Pp. 116.)

Lenaway, Sister M. Albert, O.P., *Principles of Education according to Bishop Dupanloup.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1942. Pp. xi. $2.00.) This work, directed by Associate Professor Edward B. Jordan, is a discussion of the educational principles of the famous bishop of Orleans, prefaced by a biographical essay on Dupanloup.

Loyola, Sister M., O.P., *Visualized Church History.* (New York: Oxford Book Co., Inc. 1942. Pp. viii, 328. Paper 80c.; cloth, $1.12.)

Lortie, Lucien, *Bibliographie analytique de l'oeuvre de l'Abbé Arthur Maheux.* (Quebec: Distributed by Ryerson Press, Toronto. 1942. Pp. 159.)

Macartney, C. A., *Problems of the Danube Basin.* (Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co. 1942. Pp. 160. $1.25.) Number 12 of the Current Problems Series edited by Ernest Barker.

Maguire, William A., *Rig for Church.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1942. Pp. xiv, 251. $2.00.) An account of the eventful life of a navy chaplain as experienced by the author.

Maheux, Abbé Arthur, *French Canada and Britain.* Translated by R. M. Saunders. (Toronto: Ryerson Press. 1942. Pp. 121. Paper $1.00; cloth, $1.50.)

Marchant, Alexander, *From Barter to Slavery: The Economic Relations of Portuguese and Indians in the Settlement of Brazil, 1500-1580.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1942. Pp. 160, xiv. $1.50.)

Marguerite, Sister M., S.N.D., *This is Our Home,* Pre-Primer; *This is Our Family,* Primer; *These are Our Friends,* Book One; *These are Our Neighbors,* Book Two. Faith and Freedom Series. (New York: Ginn and Company, published for the Catholic University of America Press.

1942. Pp. 48; 160; 175; 256. 28c.; 68c.; 80c.; 88c.) A letter of Pope Pius XI (September 1938) urged training in Christian citizenship as an antidote against materialism. The American hierarchy turned to the Catholic University of America to sponsor a crusade of instruction. The readers listed above are the first important fruits of the Commission on American Citizenship of the Catholic University of America. They seem admirably adapted to make good American citizens of young boys and girls. They were written under the supervision of the Reverend George Johnson of the Department of Education of the Catholic University of America. The make-up of the readers and the illustrations done by Charlotte Ware and Corinne Malvern are superb. One envies the children who are privileged to use them. Further readers in the series will soon be ready for distribution.

Marraro, Howard R., *Memoirs of the Life and Peregrinations of the Florentine Philip Mazzei, 1730-1816.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1942. Pp. xvi, 447. $4.00.)

Mayo, Bernard, (Ed.), *Thomas Jefferson and his Unknown Brother Randolph.* (Charlottesville: Tracy W. McGregor Library, University of Virginia. 1942. Pp. 41. $5.00.) This work contains twenty-eight letters written between 1807 and 1815 having to do with family matters published for the first time. The volume is presented in a handsome format which is a credit to the University of Virginia Press. Professor Mayo's introduction gives a setting for the letters and furnishes an explanation of their provenance and importance for students of the third President.

Mumey, Nolie, *History of the Early Settlements of Denver, 1599-1860.* (Glendale: Arthur H. Clark Co. 1942. Pp. xvi, 213, plus two maps and city directory for 1859. $6.00.)

Nevins, Allan, *The United States. A Brief History.* (London: Oxford University Press. 1942. Pp. 144. $1.50.) A condensed version of United States history for the use of English school children. It carries a Foreword by John G. Winant, United States Ambassador to Great Britain.

Pastor, Ludwig von, *The History of the Popes.* Vols. 33 and 34. Translated and edited by Dom Ernest Graf, O.S.B. (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1941. Pp. xxxv, 554; xiii, 596. $5.00 each.)

Proceedings of the Eighth American Scientific Congress. Vol. I. *Organization, Activities, Resolutions, and Delegations.* (Washington: Department of State. 1941. Pp. 539.) The subtitle of this publication summarizes the contents of this first volume on the Congress held in Washington, May 10-18, 1940.

Proceedings of the Seventh Conference of Teachers of International Law and Related Subjects. (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 1941. Pp. xiii, 210. $1.00.) The meeting at which these papers were read was held in Washington, April 23-23, 1941. There were seven sessions. Among the papers given were: "Proposals for Research in American Foreign Relations," Edward Mead Earle; "Research Organization and Procedure within the Department of State," E. Wilder Spaulding; "Interdepartmental Seminars and Study Groups," Norman J. Padelford; "Democracy and International Organization," by Clyde Eagleton; "Democracy and Foreign Policy," by Max Lerner; "National Socialist Doctrine of World Organization," by Hans Morgenthau; "Communist Doctrines of World Organization," by Malbone W. Graham; "Totalitarian Japan and International Organization," by Harold M. Vinacke; "Political Aspects of Inter-American Organization," by Charles G. Fenwick; "Economic Aspects of Pan Americanism," by Benjamin H. Williams; "The Problems of Post-War International Economic Organization," Henry F. Grady. There is an excellent index.